

ICANN

**Moderator: Rob Hoggarth
September 29, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you. And again, welcome everybody. This is Rob Hoggarth from ICANN staff accompanied by Benedetta Rossi. Just confirming we have Elisa Cooper, Rafik Dammak, Rudi Vansnick, Jimson Olufuye, Steve Metalitz, Tony Holmes, Lori Schulman. Have I missed anybody? Oh, yes, have I missed anyone? Great.

Well welcome, everybody, and thanks for participating. Benedetta circulated a preliminary or proposed agenda for you all where I hope we can run through some of the initial logistics and then help you really focus on some of the critical input from all of you on agenda topics and speakers.

Wanted to give you a quick update since our last call in terms of what we've done in terms of reaching out to our internal colleagues, confirming with them sort of the support that we're going to be able to get for this meeting.

I proceeded, since the last call, on focused for a DC location in Washington DC in the middle of January. The meetings team has devoted a staff member to our support; the IT team has devoted a technical person for our support.

We've already begun some preliminary research with the meetings team with respect to hotels and meeting venues in Washington DC.

For those of you who are in this area you know that since there will be a midterm election in the US for members of Congress that the January timeframe is going to be quite challenging in terms of space availability and the rest so we've gotten on that as quickly and as early as we can.

One of the things that we had talked about as a group on our last call was to have a number of you - particularly those of you in the DC area - do some inquiries, share with us if you could potential meeting locations and the rest. Thanks to those of you who have done so.

Unfortunately, no one magically arrived on their white charter to present us with the perfect meeting space for free so we're looking at a number of different options with the goal being free or nominal use of space which, as many of you in the DC area know, is quite challenging.

But I'm hopeful that we will be able to narrow things in that regard over the course of the next 2.5, 3 weeks as a lot of folks in a number of these places come back from vacation and some slower work time during the US summer.

I think our major challenge - and this is something that I touched on when we first spoke in our initial call - is simply the fact that we found almost an ideal model from a cost perspective having things located at the Los Angeles headquarters of ICANN where we could use our own space, where there was a contract in place with a hotel at a very reasonable rate.

And the new location changes those calculations so Benedetta and I are trying to work with our colleagues so that we can meet our budget targets and not

generally expose the rest of you to those machinations and just let you focus on the real substance of the meeting. So I'm hopeful we will continue to do that.

I've been assured by our IT team that they can very efficiently relocate a lot of our equipment. And we - basically now have built up over the course of the last five or six years an excellent set of black boxes and microphones and everything else that can be transported around the world to support some of these meetings and that's going to be the case with this meeting as well. So that's just another calculation for us to figure out as we look at venues.

But please, as some of you have not had a lot of time to devote to this project over the last couple of weeks, if you have brainstorm, if you have ideas about venues or different organizations in the Washington DC area who may be able to give us some support please just flag a name or a contact so that I can reach out to them or that Stacy, my meetings team colleague, can coordinate that as well that would be very helpful.

Any questions or comments otherwise with respect to logistics? Something that I perhaps should be doing that needs some assurance on or any other observations just generally about venues?

Marilyn Cade: Rob, it's Marilyn. Can I get in the queue?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Marilyn, welcome.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: You are first in line.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Can I get in the queue after that? This is Steve Metalitz.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Steve.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry to be a few minutes late so I missed the roll call. My apologies for that. A new idea that's just emerged to me would be if we could get - if we could use a company for the side meetings, two spaces on one day and then - or a law firm for those breakouts or NGOs and then just pay for one day for the full NCPH meeting.

Because the thing I've encountered when I've gone to companies and I also have spoken to some of the NGOs, two full days is really tough. If it's one day or that they provide two rooms for breakouts of smaller numbers that could work. Setting up for two back to back days taking up all their space is difficult.

So I have explored space that I know about. There's two companies and hotels around the corner from both of them that could be explored. There's also a university that might charge for one day if we could get companies to donate space for the other two days.

There's also - and I'm glad Steve is going to speak - you know, maybe others have contacts at law firms that could donate space for part of the time. And I don't mean to move us around much but if we were doing breakouts on Day 1 and then a full day the following day it means little moving and it might limit the amount of cost.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Marilyn. That's some very helpful suggestions there. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I had a question. Since we - do we have - since our rock star CEO may be an attraction to some of these venues, for example to teach or meet with a class at a school or something like that, are we in a position to dangle that as an incentive for some entity to give us free or reduced cost space? In other words, is Fadi available for that?

Rob Hoggarth: That's a - I will definitely explore that, that's a good idea. I mean, we've already blocked his calendar for that week. His admin team has said yes, I mean, if we can combine this with other things potentially in Washington DC that week that would be great, Rob.

At this point who knows what potentially comes up three, four months from now. But, yes, I think that's definitely worth exploring, Steve. Thanks for the suggestion. That may be - yes, if he's willing to do that, and I can't imagine him not be, that could be a good tradeoff potentially for some space.

I really like Marilyn's idea and this is something to think about with respect to your agenda discussions and topics. That's a creative solution to basically say that general assembly if you will, you know, for the major group could all convene on one day and then as we have enough, you know, opportunities for different conference room for the breakouts on a separate day or, you know, a morning or an afternoon.

That would be almost perfect because then we could just produce the agenda and we would say, for example, BC, you know, tomorrow you'll be meeting at, you know, this address in this conference room and then we'll just convene the next day for the general assembly and wrap up or something along those lines.

You know, we also have the flexibility to feature in some form of a networking reception or something like that throughout the course of the week. That would be another opportunity to sort of bring everybody together.

I think a lot of it really depends in terms of the direction you all want to take it in terms of combining that capability to have individual meetings within your community and then translate that into some positive full day sessions of a general assembly of everybody together.

Anyone else have any other comments, suggestions or observations?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I just have one. Do you have a rough budget if you needed to pay for space?

Rob Hoggarth: The overall budget that's been targeted for this meeting is \$73,000. I would like to have as much of that targeted for travel support. For the Los Angeles meeting, to give you all a general ballpark, the travel came out to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$60,000 total, you know, for the 48-50 participants.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: That's my target. The guidance from the Board and the senior staff was, use the model in the previous one that seemed to be so successful and so it cost you \$70,000, we'll give you \$73,000. So that's in that calculation. Other, you know, like if I have a variance of \$3000, \$4000 because we had to pay some organization a nominal fee for space or something like that, you know, I'm sure I can squeeze that out of the budget.

Again, I want you all focused as much as possible on the substance of the meeting. But knowing many of you are budget gurus, you know, any thoughts

and ideas and some of the suggestions that you've shared already are going to be very helpful so thank you.

I mean, for some of you who have run meetings in the DC area you know that that is a challenging budget but I'm confident that we can make it. And please, you know, keep up any ideas over the course of the next week or so by email. A number of you have shared with me some private emails that we're going to follow up on so thanks very much for that topic.

Anything else in terms of venue? I think, you know, that'll sprinkle in in terms of agenda and topics and potential speakers so I think that, you know, we'll just sort of jump in and out of that over the course of the next half hour or so.

Great. And I'm sorry my screen collapsed here, let's see if anyone's hand is up. No, not at the moment but thanks also for folks to include anything in the chat because we're going to copy that so any suggestions or brainstorms that you had there that would be helpful.

Agenda Item 4 was agenda topics and speakers. And I thought that would be the real meat of the discussion today. Marilyn, you sort of kicked it off in one perspective here to start talking about how we might break up the days. I think that there was general consensus on the last call that we would be looking at two days of activities with respect to the intercessional meeting.

Some of you might look to add some additional community activities or other things around that week but the real focus of this team would be on those two days. And I think at least you've teed it up a little bit, Marilyn, just in terms of your discussion this concept of, you know, one day for the community, the other day for sort of the general group to break up into individual community sessions.

That seems to be the best direction but I'd love to hear anyone's follow up comments now that you've had a couple weeks to think about it.

Marilyn Cade: And if I might, just before you take comments. I was just trying to figure out the easiest way to manage space, I must say. That was why I raised that as an idea just to reinforce why I proposed that.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. And I certainly understood it that way. You know, we don't want necessarily, the cart before the horse but I think that that's just a practical consideration that we're going to have to keep in mind as we put this together so it was really good that you teed that up first.

Steve, your hand is up. Please, sir.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. From the commercial side I agree with - in general with this and I also agree we shouldn't let the space, if possible not have the space concerns dictate the agenda.

I don't see that we need a full day of meetings of either my constituency or the stakeholder group. I think we maybe - half a day. But then the second half of that day maybe is a time for us to get together as a house. This is one thing that we have not had much - really any time to do at ICANN meetings. And we have a number of issues that we want to discuss. I don't know what they are exactly right now.

But - and so without staff present or with very minimal staff involvement my thinking would be half a day for constituency and stakeholder group on their own and then half a day for the house. And then the second day would be more in a programmatic with staff and so forth. That's just my thought. I don't

think that we need a full day of meetings at the constituency or stakeholder group level. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you for that. That is helpful. And I think that is an issue in terms of planning. I mean, again, logistics always creep into this. You know, if we've got the ICANN IT team doing the setup I would have them focused on whatever the general meeting of the house would be and then, you know, to the extent that we were able to secure conference rooms at various locations around the city for the individual meetings I think what we would do there is rely on the facilities in those spaces probably just, you know, a conference room, telephone, you know, some sort of polycom in the middle of a table.

For the more general session we would have potentially something much more elaborate akin to, you know, either what we did in Los Angeles where the tables and mics or some sort of, you know, round table sort of discussion in a big room where everybody's looking at each other and have mics in front of them or one mic to queue people.

So again, that's just something that we need to think of in terms of timing. I think it's very helpful, Steve, that you raise the issue of issues and topics. I think that that may be the best area to focus on because then that will help drive sort of how we do handle the logistics.

I really picked up on your last call that real theme that you all seem to embrace about the value of discussing things as a house, finding matters of commonality or at the very least, common interest that is a value to have you together and talking as a group. And so that may be an area that some of your comments and observations really want to focus on.

And I note Tony's comment in the chat supporting Steve's proposal for the house meeting. Steve, did you hand go back up for a follow up?

Steve Metalitz: No, sorry.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Rob, after Tony can you put me back in the list for questions here?

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly, thank you. Tony, did you want to expand upon your comment in the chat room?

Tony Holmes: No, I think I said everything. I just support the proposal from Steve for a house meeting. Thanks, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you. I'm having a couple connectivity issues here myself so I'm currently barred from the chat room, so, Benedetta, if you can keep an eye on hands and stuff like that that would be helpful.

Marilyn, you're next in the queue, you had a question?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I'm not in the chat. I don't know if I'll be able to get in the chat. But so I really appreciate that we're not relying on chat for - and that you and Benedetta will call to those of us - attention to those of us who are not in chat.

Can we just do numbers for a minute here? Two breakouts of half days - I counted at 21-30 each as max on the two breakouts. It's - sorry - but if we have - I just wanted to confirm that we're talking about SG meeting, not constituency meetings. Constituency meetings would mean five rooms, SG meetings would be two rooms. But the numbers would be higher.

And then for house, the house is the same count for half-day Day 1 and full-day Day 2 but on Day 2 it would be plus ICANN staff, right? Can I just verify that?

Rob Hoggarth: Well ultimately, you know, this is a collective consensus discussion about how you guys want to work it so I'm not, you know, I'm not in a position to dictate that. It's really an issue of when you think it's valuable to have staff.

I anticipated that, you know, we are likely to have - you are likely to have me and Carlos Reyes there for support throughout the course of the two days. Nancy Lupiano has volunteered to come down from New Jersey to provide some meeting support. And we have one IT person. So from a logistics standpoint that's sort of the team.

From the perspective of additional content subject matter experts, if you will, you've identified Fadi. Then the only other issue is whether others might be able to participate either in person or by a remote facility. And that's really dependent upon where your agenda and topics go.

I mean, if you want to talk about GDD issues and you want to have Akram do a briefing, if there are matters about, you know, because we're in North America you want Christopher Mondini to talk about some of the regional operating plans or strategies that are being set up, you know, there you've got somebody who can just come across town or a couple blocks away to come speak.

So I think that, you know, that's just dependent, Marilyn, on what direction you want the agenda to take and how you want to approach it. I think...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I just want to get the room out of the way so we can focus on that, which I think is the more substantive discussion. So if it's a half day it's SG and that's two rooms and that's - that's roughly two rooms that will seat 21-30 people then we know what we're asking for.

The second half day is 7 times 6, I think, that's 42 then we know what we're asking for. And then the second full day, which includes a number of ICANN staff, and even maybe others that we decide to invite, it's 42-45 of us plus, you know, X number of speakers.

I'm just trying to get that down so we can go to substance because I want to get out of the argument about the - sorry, the debate about how many rooms we need and move into substance. So if I have roughly the countdown that would help, Rob, in my coming back to you with ideas and maybe others like Steve and others who are native to Washington giving you ideas as well.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, great. Thanks, Marilyn. And I'd love to hear other's input on that. What you have posited there, Marilyn, is a focus on the house and the stakeholder groups. And I'm curious as to the interest of the individual constituencies whether it's also that opportunity.

And if a meeting like that were to take place would that be part of the main agenda or would you just do it, you know, the getaway morning when you know - when we know folks are, you know, taking off that last day or the arrival afternoon when people are coming in if that might work as well.

I see Steve's hand. I hope it's to address this issue. Steve, please.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, it is. Well - and your last comment, we are - our tentative dates are a Monday and Tuesday now, right, aren't they? I mean, obviously it might change but isn't that correct?

Rob Hoggarth: Correct. That's our target. We're looking at January 12 and 13, that's a Monday and Tuesday.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well my only amendment to - I'm totally with what Marilyn said with one amendment which is that we might have - we might want to have our constituency meet briefly on that Monday morning separately from the stakeholder group but in general I think that's correct.

It'd be mostly stakeholder group Monday morning, full house Monday afternoon, full house plus limited ICANN staff on Tuesday. I don't think that the space limitations would be much different Monday afternoon and Tuesday, at least that's my thinking. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Lori, your hand is up; you're next in the queue please.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I think my thinking is a little bit different than Steve's. I was actually thinking it might be a good idea to put some constituency time in that official schedule block. I know for our constituency, nonprofit organizations, we don't always, you know, we don't have high turnouts at the regular ICANN meetings. And perhaps because this is in Washington and maybe we could attract more - at least North American NGOs.

And so I would actually like to see constituencies part of the agenda as well. I mean, I know that nonprofits are certainly part of NCSG but I think for NPOC - and Rudi can chime in or not - I think it's important to us to try to work on

building an identity as a constituency beyond just the three ICANN meetings and this might be a good way to do it.

Rob Hoggarth: Lori, you make - go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, can I get back in the queue for just a minute?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes please, you're next.

Marilyn Cade: After - Lori, I'm just going to comment on this. We have held BC events in Washington and we also did something jointly with - it was open to other commercial players. And we went to a trade association and got the room space for that and did a half-day event or a three-hour event. But we didn't rely on ICANN to do it.

If the idea is that we might do - I don't want to diminish this. I hear what Lori is saying. It's just for us we could probably get space for a two or three hour session for our constituency or for the SG. But I think maybe Steve and Tony and I ought to talk about that. This is beginning to sound like two to three hours where constituencies separately maybe two to three hours for SGs and then - sorry, guys, allergies - a house meeting all on one day. Is that what we're talking about?

Steve Metalitz: No.

Tony Holmes: I'd like to get the queue as well please.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve, could I get in the queue?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I've got Rafik then Tony then Steve. But, Lori, did you want to respond to that first?

Lori Schulman: Yes, I didn't see it all as being a one-day thing. I thought this was over a couple of days and that we had some flexibility. I think also, you know, ramming 9 or 10 or 11 hours of meetings into a day is not a good idea, you lose - you have people lost interest and you have people dropping off from certain sessions.

I think the idea of planning and budgeting time is crucial and I'm not sure that - you know, a three-hour meeting would be required; maybe it's a 90-minute meeting. You know, I think we can be flexible with time as well as with thinking about, you know, how we're going to parcel out groups. That's my only thought.

And I do see this not stacking everything in one particular day, we have two days to work with. I mean, the full session could be a half a day, it doesn't necessarily have to be a whole day. I mean, I think that's going to depend on how the, you know, how the programming and the speakers and there's a lot of unanswered questions as to the hours I think.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Lori. Yes, that's helpful. You might also consider - and I don't know within the NPOC who organized it last time. But when we did Los Angeles I think NPOC did - and maybe one other group - again, similar to what we've been talking about - use the opportunity of being in Los Angeles to hold some separate events or, you know, do something else within the city that created some outreach opportunities, provided some networking and the rest.

Many of you will recall we also had a networking reception that, you know, allowed for us to have an event where local people could come. They may not

have participated in any of the meetings but who could come and meet and greet and get to know and see a little bit of networking.

So that's something that you may want to explore particularly also if you're just talking about a 90-minute session or something like that we may be able to play with the schedule to, as I think Steve suggested, start a little bit later in the day or end a little bit earlier that then give individual communities options to do something else.

I had Rafik, Tony and Steve. Rafik, you first, sir.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Rob. Say, regarding this meeting I thought the main idea is to have kind of meetings for the whole house because we don't have so much opportunity really to discuss about a lot of issues that concern the two side, the CSG and NCSG. So I think we need really to dedicate a lot of time to - for that.

So if some constituency want meetings, okay, we have two days. But the idea is to have meetings for those in DC I think maybe they can organize something prior or after this - probably prior then so they can organize and discuss and prepare for the two days.

So I want to really that we can utilize okay, to optimize these two days between the two part of the house and work. But I think we need to move on what kind of issue and topics we want to discuss and find a common, how say, common ground between us.

So if we can work on this it will be really more I think, more useful in term of utilize the time we will have. Just two days, for some people, they will like come from far away. For me it will take 12 hours I really want just if you take

the chance that we focus on the - how to say, the non-contracted party house issues.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, Rafik. Tony, you're next.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Rob. My comments go exactly down the same path as Rafik. We don't get much time to meet as a house and that's really been the focus for this activity. And it is only two days. I'd also support the view that that's where the focus should be.

Certainly the ISP constituency it isn't focused around Washington. And I think if there are constituencies who want to take advantage of this and include the broader community that they have outside of those that will just be attending this meeting then that's fine. But I think they should make their arrangements ideally around this meeting and not as part of it. So I think we can use our time better.

And I also think it is easier with the logistics if we can focus basically on house. And maybe breaking it up into stakeholder groups, I think that may be warranted, but taking it down to constituencies as part of this time, I don't really think that's justified.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Tony. For those of you now in the chat Lori has written, "After listening to Rafik and Tony I would tend to agree that finding common ground is crucial. If prioritizing time then finding common ground is more important." And Rudi says, "I agree with Rafik and Tony. Indeed, there are a lot of aspects on the NCPH structures we need to get in discussion." Thank you for writing that stuff and that contribution.

Steve, you're next in the queue.

Steve Metalitz: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: And then it's open.

Steve Metalitz: ...I have to agree more with the old Lori than the new Lori but all I'm - I think - on that second day we don't have to have eight hours or nine hours of full house programming; we could have - build in there an hour or two for breakout groups, which could be a constituency group if that's how they choose to use it. So, you know, there's some advantages to not having the same group all day anyway so I think we could probably accommodate that.

Let me just say in terms of meeting prior or after, this is why I asked if it's Monday and Tuesday because if it's Monday and Tuesday then Sunday is the prior and that, frankly, is more challenging to get people to come to a Sunday afternoon prior meeting. So I suppose one way to handle that would be to say well - the intercessional will be Tuesday and Wednesday and that leaves Monday open for those groups that wish to organize something prior to do so. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Steve. I think all this is very helpful to lead me to the not surprising conclusion that it is absolutely critical that we move as quickly as we can to get a venue nailed down that that will then help us, in some respects, be able to think about this potential additional programming, arrange logistics and the rest.

Because the only thing that all of you have said that raises a concern in the back of my head is potentially moving back and forth to different setups or

different rooms. That's the only logistical thing I think with the potential to cause difficulties for remote participation or just the (AV) side of stuff. Something we can handle but just something that I'd like to minimize as much as possible in terms of setup, breakdown, move things around just from the IT perspective.

And thanks, Tony said in the chat he would also support Tuesday and Wednesday as a better option. We've got the target of early that week and so we'll explore both of those. Thank you very much, Tony and Steve, on that.

Let's turn - and, Lori, you've raised your hand. I trust it's on this issue and sort of use that as a wrap up in terms of some of those general thoughts about house versus stakeholder group versus constituencies.

Lori Schulman: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And then what - what I'd like to do is turn to, you know, actual topics and issues. Please, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I don't want to waste more time but I can't over-emphasize that I know we don't get together often and I know when we do there's the tendency to schedule as much as possible in these, you know, just as I said, 10, 11, 12 hours, as we all know. And I honestly find that way of scheduling unproductive. And I just - I want to just put that out there that we be mindful of that so that this isn't the typical, you know, 7:00 am until 1:00 in the morning kind of a - because I don't always find that pleasant and I just wanted to say that.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Thank you very much. And for those of us who'll be commuting in the DC area 7:00 am to 1:00 am would not be the perfect way out either. Thanks for making that observations.

Can we turn to topics? And I would love to have a number of you start to throw out different thoughts and ideas. It would be really helpful to see what the potential universe of topics is just from a brainstorming perspective because I think that would help us then begin to prioritize or decide what needs to float up, what needs general house discussions versus stakeholder groups. Tony, you were quick with your hand so you're first, sir.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Rob. Just for starters one of the things I think we definitely need some discussion around is GNSO reform.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. While you have the mic would you like to add anything else?

Tony Holmes: I think I should let others go and if my preference doesn't come up I'll be back in. Thanks, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, it's Marilyn. Can I comment as well?

Rob Hoggarth: Please, Marilyn. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I support that discussion. I don't know if I would have used the word "reform" but I think the concept - and I would ask Tony to comment and others on this - review and assessment and ideas for improvements because if it's just GNSO reform I think there's a number of topics I'd like to put in play. One is - gosh,

discussion about the role of the GNSO in ICANN governance, not just in gTLD policy.

And I don't know that fits under GNSO reform but I think it does fit into a discussion about review of the role of the GNSO and its communities' engagement in ICANN governance as well as linkages to other supporting organizations, SGs, etcetera, no sorry not SGs, supporting organizations and advisory committees. And I don't know, Tony, that may be going (the) lexicon what you were thinking about.

Tony Holmes: Can I comment, Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. Certainly it does go beyond what I was thinking about but I do think it's a very valid topic. I think the discussion probably goes wider than GNSO Council's role in Internet governance as well. I think there's a broad sweep of issues that you can discuss as to how they fit with the GNSO. So I think that is a very relevant topic that we should spend some time on.

And the other part of Marilyn's input where she mentioned about interaction with other groups as well, other stakeholder groups and supporting organizations, I almost see that as a third strand of that conversation as well. But all three of them are certainly items that I think should be on this agenda and this would be the correct place to discuss them.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Tony. Lori, your hand was up. Before you speak I'd like to note Rudi's comment on the chat. "A topic I think would be interesting for NPOC, how to get members involved in the constituency work." Thank you, Rudi.

Lori Schulman: Yes, mine actually piggybacks on Rudi's comment. I think this would be a great opportunity to talk about reaching beyond the bubble. The remit particularly in terms of the IANA transition is about multistakeholder-ism in a really broad context. And I view it as ICANN and beyond really and how do we effectively manage the "and beyond."

And I think having the non-contracted houses together to talk about that because we have such a deep stake in what is going on but I think we're also at times in some ways maybe the most constricted by obligations we may have to clients or obligations, you know, just being as busy as we are that we don't ever get together as a group to talk about multistakeholder-ism in a really broad way. And we would be the perfect group to do it.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Lori. Steve, your hand is up and you're next in line.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. This is Steve. Two points, one building on what Rudi entered in the chat and what Lori said, my notes from our first call had the phrase "effective outreach and onboarding" which is another way of saying - perhaps saying reaching beyond the bubble and getting members involved in work.

And I think that's a useful title because ICANN is - and the useful topic for the part of the second day because ICANN is spending enormous resources in trying to get more people involved. And my sense, and I think the sense of some of the others on this call might be that that money - those resources are not always being used most effectively. And we may have some ideas about how to use them better to bring more people in and get more people actually active. So that's one point.

Second, in terms of the house discussions that may not involve staff, I mean, I think there really are two areas here. One is there are certain things that we

have to do together as a house like electing Board members and so forth, that we haven't proven very good at. And we've had a lot of rocky - a lot of problems with that. And I think it would be worth having a discussion about if you will, our constitutional duties under the bylaws where we have to act as a house.

The second is an area where it is - what are our common issues - substantive issues. And we've seen some examples recently where we've come together on a position. I think there are probably more where we could do that. And I think without getting into specific topics I think part of our agenda on that first afternoon should be let's identify a couple of issues where we think we can do more together on a substantive issue and see how we might be able to do that.

Rob Hoggarth: Steve, along those lines if I can ask, would you be looking to use the meeting to identify issues or would you be identifying specific issues prior that you would then use the time to actually strategize on?

Steve Metalitz: Preferably the latter, which means that we would have to have some dialogue before the meeting. I mean, I have some ideas but (unintelligible).

Rob Hoggarth: We sort of lost you there at the end, Steve, with some background interference.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I think ideally we would identify the issues before the meeting and so we would have two or three topics listed as issues of common concern and how do we work together to advance them. And we would have those two or three issues. I don't have them - I mean, I have some ideas but I think we need a little more dialogue offline about that.

Rob Hoggarth: That would be great, thanks. Because that was going to be my next question. I noted in the chat that Lori said, "Strongly support Steve's suggestion." And my follow up there was going to be, okay, well, you know, feel free to brainstorm. We still have 12 minutes in terms of what some of those potential issues might be.

I really appreciate the offer to, you know, engage online, you know, via email with some ideas here over the next week or so. Welcome, Bill Drake. Sorry about your car battery but glad that you're with us today. We've focused over the last couple of minutes on agenda and topics in particular so I don't know if you wanted to contribute any ideas, Bill, in terms of topics or issues that would be discussed during the two days.

Bill Drake: Hello, can you hear me?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, we can hear you and I've determined that you have a little bit of background noise but not so that we can't hear you at all. But now we can.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, maybe perhaps, Bill, it would be more effective for you to type with the microphone problems.

So, yes, Steve, did you want to do any brainstorm there in terms of just some potential issues just to get people's brains flowing?

Marilyn Cade: Rob? Rob, it's Marilyn. Can I - before we go to Steve can I make a comment on Steve's comment?

Rob Hoggarth: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: But I want to wait - yes, but I want to be sure Bill gets to speak or gets read out so...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: We're going to be looking for Bill to type into the chat, if that will work for you, Bill, because...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...clearly the microphone is not working and then I can read that for those of you who are not in the chat. Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Bill Drake: Sorry about that.

Marilyn Cade: If we can (unintelligible) if we come up with some topics I would like to support the discussion about effective outreach slash onboarding and try to reach some agreement perhaps among ourselves about guidance to ICANN about how they support it. And I will just say we've all used the budget process, we've submitted proposals, we get not what we asked for but something else that ICANN staff keeps designing. We get things like (cross), we get other projects that just don't fully support us.

So I think if we could make that a category and come back and give feedback - organized feedback then that would also help us inform the ICANN staff about how we all work together to improve the budget process. That would be one.

The other one that I want to support is the idea of how we address our constitutional duties. And having a discussion about making sure we understand what our constitutional duties are. And then talking about how we improve our fulfillment of them.

Rob Hoggarth: What - can you clarify what - not what Steve means by it - I'll have him do that - but what you mean by constitutional duties? Are you referring to the bylaws, the GNSO procedures, can you clarify?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, happy to. So, one, we have constitutional duties to make appointments to the Nominating Committee; we have constitutional duties to elect a Board member that comes from the NCPH. We have also constitutional duties in terms of respect for the values of ICANN, the geographic diversity issues, things like that.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Yes, you read the bylaws, and I will tell you that very few of us have a lot of time to read the bylaws. I cheated because I held (unintelligible) 16, 17 years ago so I only have to read the changes. But I think for all officers understanding what our constitutional responsibilities are, I like that term, it's really helpful.

So I'll just give an example. A Board member once elected, does not represent a community. That's what the bylaws say. We also have other, you know, other issues. I think it'd be helpful. It doesn't have to be long, it could be short,

maybe no more than an hour. But let's make sure we all understand, as elected officers, and then we help our communities understand.

Rob Hoggarth: Help me, did that - is that more of a dialogue? Is that something where there's, you know, a constitutional authority? How do you see something like that developing? And I recognize Bill's comment in the chat that there is plenty of time to identify specific substantive topics but I'm just trying to get a sense as I share with you later some block scheduling or something like that, of topics. What do you potentially envision there, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Well I would envision maybe just a short grouping and then a dialogue. So it could be a briefing by the General Counsel's office of no more than 30 minutes, 20-30 minutes and then it would be question and answer. But I would turn to - I think we then have a separate discussion about how we fulfill the responsibility on the election. But that's separate to me.

This is a pre - it's sort of a setting the stage and then we talk about how we apply something like Board elections which is a cross NCPH. Our appointment of Nominating Committee members is individual so that doesn't need to take up group time. But I would turn to Steve to ask his and Rafik's and Bill's comments as well.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Marilyn. I do see Rafik's hand up. Let me read Steve's comment and then, Steve, if you'd like to speak after Rafik that would be great. Steve said, "I was using constitutional duties," in quotes, "much more narrowly. I can think of two things NCPH must do as a house: Elect Board Seat Number 14 and elect a GNSO Council vice chair." Bill responds, "I would construe it per Steve."

Rafik, you're next.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. I was going to comment what Steve said a few minutes ago. So I think we can start after this call kind of follow up between - the representative from the non-contracted parties kind of listing what kind of issue we want talk about so that the brainstorming of, I mean, through emails and then we, I mean, because, personally I want really to consult with the NCSG leadership what we should discuss. So we can follow up to move more quickly.

And about the issue that - the narrow constitutional duties that list by Steve I think it's one about election for the Board seat it's something that we need to handle and not wait for the next three years to fix that.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, Rafik. This is all very helpful. I appreciate all the comments you're making. I'm taking copious notes. And what I'm going to try to do for the follow up from this call is like we did for the previous meeting preparation, try to identify some common themes here and then get you all to react to see if I'm, you know, characterizing things or gelling things in the right direction.

Bill noted as a comment in the chat, "It would be nice if we could do more than those two things together, referring to the Board Seat 14 and the GNSO Council vice chair. But let's focus on what we must do together. And Elisa has indicated agreement both with Bill and Steve's comments.

Bill, we are still - Bill asked in the chat that we lock in a date and a place. We are still focused, as Elisa responded, on the January 12 and 13. We are still looking for venues within DC and the possibility is open depending on venues and we will look to the opportunity to potentially slide the meeting if we have to to the 13th and 14th which may give individual constituencies and

opportunity to do some additional activities or events in DC on their own during that week.

One thing I had on the agenda that I don't want to tee up at this moment given that we're going into our last 90 seconds or so - and thanks, Kristina, I note that you have to jump off and others may have to as well - is we had talked about trying to leverage the location of Washington DC to potentially having some speakers. They might - or could be a piece of our general, you know, all house meeting.

So continue to keep that in the back of your mind. And maybe bring it forward a little bit with some potential ideas of if not individuals types of people that you might be interested in talking and DC provides advantages not just for the political connections but think tanks and technical capabilities and the rest. So please, if you could also think about that that would be really helpful.

In terms of getting together again, typical to what we did in the last preparation process, Benedetta and I will come out with a summary of this call to share with you all like I did after our last call in preparing that story line. We'll share with you, you know, the beginnings of what might look like a two day schedule. I'm going to interface with our IT team to see what advice they can provide in terms of staging and setup again, realizing that we have some venue discussions to conclude there.

Benedetta and I have a call scheduled with Stacy Hoffberg later on today where we'll have some more discussions about meeting locations and venues and so your comments today have been very timely and helpful in that regard. And please, otherwise, keep sending me the emails. I really appreciate the suggestions and ideas.

I think what we should shoot for is a call within the next 2.5 weeks or so so Benedetta will go out with a Doodle poll. I'd love to have something on the calendar. You can all, you know, at a certain point say, no, that's fine, we don't need a call. But I'd like to have something on the calendar.

Marilyn Cade: Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: A call would be fine but most of the people on this - are going to be in Turkey for...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Oh, that's right.

Marilyn Cade: And I go to Iran on the 28th. So, you know, I don't have to be on this but just to note that I don't know, Bill, Rafik, others, I think that means September the 7th or 8th would be the earliest. Can I just check with you guys? Seventh, eighth, ninth? I won't be back from Turkey until then.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks for that feedback. We will be mindful of that realizing that this is perhaps not at the top of your agendas when you're involved in the IGF discussion so we'll plan around that and including some of the travel. And we'll do what we can as much as possible via email. I just - I just really appreciate the commitment that you all are making to talk this through. And while January still seems quite far away it's coming very fast.

So thank you all very much for participating in this call all your thoughts and contributions. We will follow up with email with a summary. And thank you

for taking this step by step as we move along the process. I really appreciate it.

Have a great weekend, everybody. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

END