

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
November 26, 2015
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Jamie. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the NCPH Intercessional meeting on Wednesday the 25th of November, 2015. On the call today we have Phil Corwin, Tony Holmes, Greg Shatan, Rudi Vansnick, Laurie Schulman, Tapani Tarvainen, Kiran Malancharuvil. And from staff we have Robert Hoggarth, Benedetta Rossi, Carlos Reyes, Ozan Sahin, Chantelle Doerksen, Adam Peake and myself, Maryam Bakoshi. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much over to you, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Maryam, and welcome everybody. I very much appreciate you all being able to schedule this call particularly our US participants who are probably ready to travel or are traveling for the US Thanksgiving holiday.

I've got a fairly broad agenda for today. I mainly threw up the proposed agenda to try to issue spot the various things that we'll need to go over and

talk about either today or on future calls. But I wanted to sort of throw out the gamut.

A lot of this call I think will be more issue spotting and identifying areas that we're going to have to address. On a couple of them we'll probably make a little bit of progress in terms of identifying next steps, what we need to be doing over the course of the next three or four weeks between now and the end of the year to get your program solidified and make sure that we have the arrangements being made for the various attendees and participants and otherwise just to get you all comfortable with where we're going because a couple of you have not been involved in this process before and I want to make sure everybody's on board and comfortable with the arrangements that we're making.

The agenda in addition to just this welcome and making sure that I flag all of you so all of you know who you're representing, I wanted to give you a staff logistics update with respect to location, dates, travel and hotel information. I wanted to discuss with you and get your points of view in terms of meeting goals sort of what's going to be the general theme of approach and what you all really want to get out of this meeting.

I hope we can do some issue spotting with respect to programming matters. I've shared with you the length of the past intercessional meetings which are rich with content in terms of, you know, what the programming was and where things were going but I think you all as the planners should feel free to look at those past meetings as guides but not be driven by them particularly if some of the feedback that I'll share with you from the past meeting suggests changes or adjustments to how you conduct your work.

Wanted to talk about the prospect of additional community meetings outside the two days of the intercessional for those of you who might be entertaining wanting to have an extra afternoon perhaps on Wednesday the 3rd to gather, plan or otherwise just talk about things that are important for you as we start heading into 2016.

Obviously identify the next time we'll get together and raise any other issues, any other business that any of you have. Would anyone like to add anything else to the agenda? All right hearing nothing I will proceed. Just to do a quick means of identification so that everybody is clear who's representing who and where we are, at least in terms of the participants on this call I've got Tapani, you're representing the NCSG; Rafik who we hope will be joining us with respect to the NCUC; I think his alternate is also Bill who sends his regrets for this call.

Rudi, we've got you for the NPOC; Phil, I've got three people on the mailing list from the BC, you, Chris Wilson and David Fares. So I'll look to have you guys in the group. For any of you you don't really need to have more than one person on the call although the more brains and ideas the merrier. For the IPC I have Laurie as the primary but you identified Greg. And then, Greg, you and Kiran also participating. And from the ISP community, Tony, I've got you and Tony Harris.

Feel free please to - if you want to add others to the mailing list the key here is to reach consensus on the approach, the schedule the programming that you all want to take similar to what we did via email but obviously in the calls that have or in other email communications it'll be very helpful to get people's points of view and perspectives not only from past experience but new ideas and perspectives so looking forward to some of those discussions.

Let me give you an update from a staff logistics standpoint. And we'll be able to sort of look at things and confirm at least the consensus that we have to date. We're looking at our meeting in Los Angeles California specifically the two days February 4 and 5 which is that end of the first full week of February in the Los Angeles headquarters of ICANN.

We have been in discussions with a couple of different hotels. Our primary first option is the Doubletree Hilton Hotel which is only about 3.5, 4 blocks city space, if you will, from the ICANN offices. We like that location because ICANN meeting staff have a great relationship with them, we've got an ongoing ICANN relationship with them that allows us to get some good deals on the cost of rooms. And for potential meeting space if we need some overflow particularly for some of your individual meetings that you might want to take advantage of.

So we're focused on the Doubletree but also looking into some other properties around the ICANN office that will be able to accommodate us and the meetings team all would like to go for several bids to get the best possible deal for the organization. So again we're focused on the Doubletree. I'm pretty sure that we'll end up there but there are some other options that folks are looking at.

For those of you who will recall the January 2013 inaugural intercessional meeting we did arrange shuttle service. I think we have learned now that ICANN's been in that space for a longer period of time, to streamline that and make it more effective. It's an easy walk but the shuttle proved to be quite convenient for a number of folks last time and so we'll have that as a capability.

In terms of travel, I put you all on notice already and a number of you have already been working on this with Chantelle and Maryam, thank you very much, to begin amassing your list of attendees. We've set the goal benchmark of December 7 to have those rosters and names to us with the understanding that the NCUC and BC have some elections that they're in the midst of or beginning to start very shortly. And we may have a couple of contested seats there so you all don't know specifically who the individuals are.

That's perfectly understandable and if we get, you know, the 80% of meeting attendees identified by the 7th and the meetings team can be working with them then for others who may come in a little bit later who may have individual issues with visas or stuff like that I think we'll be able to accommodate that.

Getting things in early and having that information early was one of the areas that attendees from the last January meeting in DC highlighted as a very important aspect of the pre-meeting planning.

As many of you know, some of your delegations are doing this for the first time and because of the time pressures and other circumstances last year, I think a lot of people were getting nervous in terms of knowing when they were going to get their arrangements and everything else so we really want to get that nailed down as soon as possible. That I think also helps in terms of all of your pre meeting planning and liaising with your delegations for the meeting.

Are there any questions or discussion points that any of you want to raise with respect to any of the logistics for the meeting?

Tapani Tarvainen: If I may?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Tapani speaking.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir, please.

Tapani Tarvainen: You noted that it would be possible to have a pre-meeting of a Wednesday afternoon. Several people would refer to have a whole day for constituency and stakeholder group meetings, the traveling all day around the world it would be great time (unintelligible) if we can. So it is (unintelligible) can we have entire Wednesday, for example, for stakeholder group level or constituency level meetings?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Tapani, I think that's something that we can definitely arrange. I know that you all have different community make ups. We have a variety of attendees coming both US domestically and internationally and that's something that we experienced in both previous meetings. People want to be effective and somewhat getting the previous day. So as you all develop your individual plans and ideas for that we would certainly be open and flexible to accommodating you all. What we were able to do for the BC meeting, as a number of you know, is extend people's stays at the hotel by an extra day or so.

Our budget typically factors in, you know, three nights but we've got the flexibility - I tried to grab that in the budget for this fiscal year - for there to be an extra night for folks particularly if you've got that extra meeting night or that meeting day. So, yeah, we can be very flexible.

I think - and to be honest I haven't thought this through completely but in terms of timing and given the fact that we're asking for your attendee names earlier in the process, I think it would be necessary for us to know if your community wants to do a pre-meeting meeting for purposes of preparing for the meeting or just doing your annual planning that you let us know by early December.

So, I mean, when you submit your list of attendees if you can indicate at that point yes, we would like to have - excuse me - a pre-meeting on the Wednesday. And we're anticipating it would be X hours. If you guys have a full days agenda and can pound out a lot of great work then we definitely want to be supportive of that.

Any other questions? And I'm noting, Phil and Greg, your feedback on planning attendees so thanks for that information or that record. Give anyone else an opportunity to get off mute. I don't see any hands in the Adobe Connect room.

Okay if we can move on to - there's one other aspect that I want to make sure we touch on with respect to logistics and that's meeting attendees and the delegation. As I flagged for you in the previous email and what we were able to do the last time we met in Los Angeles was we had delegates - a delegate count of seven from each community group which evenly was able to divide the two stakeholder groups with 21 participants each.

That we were able to expand slightly in Washington DC because we had a larger physical space. I'm going to be in Los Angeles next week along with a number of other policy team members for one of our meetings. And we're going to play around with the space to see if there are any options to expand that a little bit to see if we can accommodate anybody else.

The experience we've had over the last two meetings and the feedback that we've gotten from you and some of your colleagues is that the numbers are just about right in terms of participants, in terms of space, in terms of layout and everything else. But we always get, you know, well can we add one or can we add two, how can we sort of play through that. I'm going to examine that and see if we can provide some additional flexibility.

Of course one of the challenges is we can't typically just add one person but if we're adding one to each group that then adds six potentially to the mix. And right now we have a count of 21 and 21 plus the NCA associated with your house, plus the ICANN board member that you all appoint from your house. And so that right there puts us at about 44. You add three or four of staff in the room and you're pushing the limit because I'm really trying to accommodate the feedback we got from the DC meeting of having the hollow square.

Some of you have participated in Los Angeles in 2013 will recall that we had a modified hollow square in which we had two tiers of work tables arrayed and sort of all facing each other in the room. I'm trying to see if we can squeeze in the complete hollow square like we had in DC last year and that's something we'll be experimenting with, we've been successful snapping some pictures of the different layouts and stuff, I'll share that with all of you so you can share with me your feedback on what might look best and how you'd like to set that up.

But I wanted to make sure I addressed that attendee issue. Right now the default is seven per group. If we find out that with physical space we can accommodate one or two more then I'll let you know but please plan for your December 7 to get us the full roster and for managing the expectations of your

own community group, please remind folks that we've had I think fairly - I mean, I say this without having Benedetta wanting to throw something at me over the phone - I think we've had very effective remote participation capabilities at the last two meetings and have also learned from that.

You'll recall that we introduced a camera at the DC meeting to give people an idea of what was going on in the room and give them more of a flavor of the experience. So we do have that as another option. And I think one of our attendees had to use that in January of this year when the travel just collapsed in terms of his air itinerary. So we still have that capability if you've got additional folks who want to participate.

I think, Laurie, you had your hand up and, Rudi, you have your hand up. So I want to give Laurie the shot first because I got a jab that you had your hand up earlier, did you take it down or did you want to make a comment, Laurie? And then Rudi would be in the queue.

Laurie Schulman: No, I think you answered my - yeah, I think you answered my question, Rob, about - I was asking about how many people this year if we were going to keep it around 30 but the 44 sounds right so I think that's all I need to know at this point.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Laurie Schulman: But I have a question about the pre-meeting.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure.

Laurie Schulman: When you say pre-meetings do you mean just this meeting just with the delegates who are coming or calling a meeting in the local area or we could do whatever we wanted.

Rob Hoggarth: Well this is building on - it's a good question. This is building on the learning experience we had in DC in January of this year. And that was that because of the clustering, if you will, of ICANN community members in Washington DC a number of your communities said, well shoot, we not only have, you know, additional members of our community who aren't in leadership but who we can, you know, help encourage or recruit or do some outreach.

And we have potentially, you know, regulators, political folks in Washington DC and embassies that we could have some really good programs outside of the two day intercessional meeting. And so a number of communities did that actually because of the timing and the dates the third day, not the first day. In this case looking at our three day window I'm proposing and have focused on the first day because as I mentioned to you all in email, there is a board workshop going on in Singapore that previous weekend and for the first couple of days that week.

There are senior staff who want to be with you who want to participate if want to be able to give Markus Kummer an opportunity to join you guys and participate, we really need to shift the two day meeting to the end of the week so that with time zone and day time differences they can make it back from Singapore to be in LA. And so that's why it's somewhat transformed this year and our learning experience will be are pre-meetings better than post meetings.

On observation, and Carlos, Benedetta and I did a post meeting survey asking meeting attendees their perspectives and points of view about how they

thought the meeting went. And one of the things that we flagged in terms of feedback that of the two areas that people were not particularly happy with that didn't get, you know, like 90 satisfaction ratings, one was the timing of the travel arrangements and the other, some of you might be surprised to see, was the stakeholder group breakout session where less than half the people were satisfied with the program. Just a little bit over half were satisfied or very satisfied.

So, I mean, in terms of statistics I think it wasn't clear to me whether folks just didn't want to have the additional meetings or breakout sessions or whether it was just more of a issue about the content of those meetings. But we wanted to give you all the options to potentially do it again so that there might be learning experiences from January that you might want to apply or with a different mix of people maybe or because the issues are different now in the ICANN community that there might be things that you really need to spend some time on.

So I wanted to leave that option open. That was a very long-winded response to your comment and question, Laurie, I hope I addressed it. Rudi, you were next in the queue.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Robert. Rudi for the transcript. Well, I have two points, the first is related to the attendee issue. As you remember I sent a message about one person that in fact is not belonging to one of the houses as the person was appointed by the NomComm to the GNSO Council. But as such, he doesn't belong to the travel slots and it's an issue that I think we should try to solve also.

It's probably one of the exceptional issues that need some attention so I would like to know if there is any progress made or is there anything that we can do from our side to help solving the issue?

And the second one is about the pre-meeting. We have an idea - a concept that we'd like to try to implement each time we have meetings in ICANN or even outside ICANN it's about the outreach program. We could take advantage of the fact that we are in Los Angeles and reach out to NGOs and get them around the table and discuss specific topics that they want us to address. So I think that would fit in the concept of the outreach program that is actually an elaboration.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah thank you so I'll address those in order. Well let me go in reverse order because your - the first item you raised I think is something for discussion among the planners. With respect to the pre-meetings - what we focused on I think the correct approach that we took for the January 2015 DC meeting was that this group would be focused on the intercessional meeting itself and that two day program and focus.

If you guys wanted, as communities, to take advantage essentially leveraging the opportunity where you've had ICANN travel support to all come to the same city intercessionally with an ICANN public meeting only about five weeks away to do some planning and other work you should take as much advantage of that as you possibly can. You guys establish what you want to talk about, you establish what agenda you want to have and what goals and expectations and plan that, you know, outside of the bounds of this.

With the understanding that you've got other staff to provide that support. One of the reasons Adam is on the call is for him to hear some of these thoughts and ideas. So, yeah, there are aspects, Rudi, of your overall strategic outreach program you guys want to take advantage of and perhaps can partner with Chris Mondini and his team or with Adam and his team through the noncommercial support group. Those would be great things to leverage this meeting off of.

What we did the very first time we did this meeting, and it was a pilot, right, for those of you who remember it. In 2013 we had a reception on the first evening where folks were given the opportunity to invite people from the Los Angeles area from an outreach perspective. And a number of communities took advantage of that. I think we ended up with about 75 or 80 people actually at the reception.

And on average I think there were two or three people locally that you all invited to participate in that so that would be another option as you're thinking about strategic outreach for ways to push the envelope a little bit and maybe bring some more people in. So please, Rudi, yeah that's something that you guys are thinking about and can work with Chris Mondini and others that would be super.

On your second point with respect to others, yes, you flagged to me and David Olive in a separate email the brainstorm about potentially inviting Carlos Gutierrez from the GNSO Council. And I think you had recognized that he doesn't have a home. I would remind you guys that you all - or your former or existing colleagues came up with the brainstorm to invite the board member and the NCA associated with your house because you all embraced the philosophy that this is a meeting that gives you opportunity to build

relationship, expand your networks and just be able to forge some connections that would help you in your additional work.

So my interpretation of that, Rudi, is that you're going to make a case at this meeting to say hey, let's invite Carlos as well. And I think that's certainly something for you guys to all talk about. When I mentioned earlier being able to squeeze another seat at the table I'm sure we could accommodate Carlos. I guess it's just a matter for you guys to discuss when we are talking a zero sum game would you rather have Carlos added or would you add somebody else, how do you want to sort of - or how do you envision your outreach on this.

So I don't know if you want to make a case for that, Rudi, that others can respond to. This maybe something, though, most of you hearing this for the first time, could say oh, interesting idea, let's talk about it and let's make a decision at the next meeting. Any follow up thoughts, Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Robert. Rudi for the transcript. Well indeed I would like to make a case as Carlos (unintelligible) in fact to our non-contracted party house as he has been nominated by the NomComm to be a member of the GNSO Council. And as such he is involved in a lot of policy work and probably needs to have also a good understanding on where our non-contracted party house discussions are going on - so that he can do that in this work as a counselor. So yes I would like to bring this up as a case and see how we can manage it.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thanks. Does anyone else have any views at this point on Rudi's proposal to add Carlos to the invite list? And I'm asking not to put anybody on the spot understanding that you might have an immediate reaction or if you want to make a decision on the next call. I'm more than happy to take either approach. Tapani, I see your hand is raised so you are next, sir.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Tapani for the record. I must support Rudi here. I think it would be good for the role of the house councilor would be perfect at (root) builder of sorts so we have a view of what's going on in both houses so having him there would be a (unintelligible) I think.

Rob Hogarth: Great. Thank you. Anyone else's comments? Great, I think what we'll do there is we've got the proposal, some growing support for Rudi's idea. Let me put this on the agenda for next time by that time we will, as staff, have been to LA, have been able to play with the room a little bit and can give you guys feedback in terms of what other potential available spaces there are. And that'll give some of you who are just hearing this concept for the first time an opportunity to maybe chat or converse with some other members of your community in terms of Carlos's participation.

I would note that I don't know yet and we will probably not know for several weeks whether (Marcus) or the other nominating committee appointee will be able to join us in terms of their travel plans.

So, you know, from the slot perspective, have a way of resolving themselves over time. And yes, (Adam), (Dan Reed) attended the (DC) meeting. Both he and (Marcus) were able to make it so that worked out nicely in terms of that concept and idea.

And both of them provided me with some very positive feedback in terms of the opportunity to join. And so I'm sure potentially (Carlos) would have that same feedback. (Rudy) thanks.

Seeing no more hands up, and we turn to the next agenda item, and this is really, you know, just a five or six minute - assuming that some of you have something to say on here.

In terms of thoughts or ideas you might have in terms of an overall theme or a goal for the meeting. And I've raised this in a couple of contexts. With some of you look at the wiki space, whether it's to get some refresher, what are we doing on this again, why are we doing this, you know, the original concept was to give your communities the opportunity outside of all the pressures of an ICANN public meeting to really sit down, think longer-term, spend some less than stressful time, you know, just talking through some of the bigger issues that impact to, and, as a community.

And what was very cool, I thought, was in the Washington, DC meeting, they're involved this concept of the communiqué. And it really was, I think, quite organic in terms of how it was introduced and how you guys just sort of came together and made the time to discuss something and come up with essentially an overall statement about the meeting and some of the issues that were currently in play at that point.

I don't know if essentially one of the goals of the meeting is producing this communiqué, whether you're looking at the goal of the meeting as something as basic as, no, we're hoping to come out of this with a better understanding of our respective communities or we want to come out of this with a better process for X or Y.

But I wanted to give you an opportunity to socialize or brainstorm a little bit about what you're trying to accomplish. There were a couple of really good comments and some of your email exchanges when we were trying to come up with a consensus for the date and time, we're a couple of you made some

really good cases for - no, no, we need to be having this meeting and this time period, not, (Rob), as you, positive potentially in late April or early May.

Because we do have issues that we need to resolve now and there are things that we need to accomplish. So, I mean, essentially what I'm looking for is an overall mission statement or - without worrying about all the, you know, crossing the Ts or dotting the Is, but just a general sense about where you all want to come out on this at the end.

That will certainly help us from a staff perspective in terms of pulling things together and I think would help you all if you get to some of the more finer points of the program, the topics you want to discuss in terms of identifying themes.

Does anybody have any thoughts or comments about that just off the top of your head are just some ideas that you'd like to share with the larger group? I'll give folks an opportunity to come off mute.

Hearing nothing at the moment, what I'd like to do then is leave this is an open item for you all to think about even as we discussed some of the other programming matters here, you may have a brainstorm or two that crops up in some of your discussions within your communities over the next week and a half or so.

If you could (posit) this is an area of focus that would be great. Harkening back to the evaluations that (Carlos), (Benedetta) and I collected after the January meeting, the feedback on the communiqué was quite positive.

Reading from our results page here, 60% of respondents were satisfied, 33 respondents were very - 33% were very satisfied, 93% of respondents would support the concept of a communiqué as a feature of future meetings.

Some people had some ideas in terms of how to do that in the future, you know, create more opportunities for drafting, maybe do some pre-meeting conversations, and that could be this planning group or others.

And what someone (posited), as well, is that, wow, that was a real group discussion and maybe it's better if we have a committee but not all of the meeting attendees to (do) some of the initial drafting work or something.

Those are all things to think about but the overall message that we got from the surveys from folks just a couple of months after the meeting was they like that concept.

So that's something I think you should all consider for this time around as well. Let me turn briefly to programming matters. And I anticipate that this might be more the bulk of your action on this call.

To give you some perspective, for those of you that may have looked back at the past program agendas, just for refresher, in Washington, DC over the two days, we had a total of 12 sessions in terms of blocks in the schedule where we had time.

One of those was the reception, so we can sort of take that off. And you see that your discussion windows are eleven. There were a couple of breakout sessions there were you broke into stakeholder groups or constituencies.

So you take those off, understanding that those are the responsibilities of you as individual community leaders to sort of get those agendas put together, you're looking at probably ten sessions over the course of the two days to sort of focus some time and issue discussions to.

What we did last year that I thought was very effective that we learned from the first meeting was we also had individual leaders or chairs for each of the sessions from among your meeting attendees, from among your delegation.

And so I think the concept of, you know, folks who might (posit) a couple of topics for the various sessions and then are willing to take a leadership role in helping us facilitate the discussions, contributing themselves as well, but otherwise sort of on those sessions, was something that worked quite well.

We don't - what I'd like to do is give you the opportunity, obviously, over emails the next couple of weeks, to throw in some suggestions. But I'd be interested, on this call, today, if some of you have any brainstorms you want to start throwing some paint at the walls here to see what may stick or what gets other people interested in terms of potential topics.

Who wants to be first? I don't see any ha- oh, there we go. Thank you, (Rudi). I was going to go in order on my attendee list and (Tipani), you are at the top of that. (Rudi), you were second. So, (Rudi), thank you for raising your hand. Please, sir, you have the floor.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Robert). (Rudi) for the transcript. Well, I think one of the topics that we should think about is, with next, essentially for our (houses)? What's next in the - when the IANA transition goes through?

How do we need to structure ourselves to be able to respond to questions that we're going to get from our community once the process has kicked off? I think that's one of the topics that we should be clear on and coordinate it amongst ourselves so we don't send out different messages.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, thank you, and that could potentially be a number of different topics, right? I mean, you've got your IANA transition sort of theme there. Your focus right now is on sort of what the - what are you saying - the structure of the GNO community would be? Is that what you're addressing or am I missing the point there a little bit?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, (Robert). Indeed, it's all about first are structure, how do we see things should move inside our different stakeholder groups and constituencies?

What are the - that each of the constituencies will have to execute once the - things are kicked off? I think that's one of the typical questions that today I would not be able to respond or to resolve.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, yes. I mean, one of the themes that was quite fresh during the Dublin meeting, the number that you mentioned to me, the individual conversations, was sort of, yes, what's happening next with the GNSO?

Part of that was the IANA transition. Part of that was the GNSO review. And more importantly, for my team at our workload, it was conversations that a number of you are raising about potential charter changes within your constituencies or stakeholder groups.

So, yes, I think there is a right area there, (Rudy), for some discussions. And what I'm doing for purposes of this call in my follow-up is, I'm just, right now, capturing these concepts and ideas.

So I will have is an overall IANA transition topic, theme, if you will, and then I'll list the number of things underneath that. And so based on your feedback right now, (Rudy), I've got sort of GNSO structures, future, and you know, once you guys see what I'm putting down on paper, please feel free to edit or play around with it.

I'm just looking for ways to jumpstart some of the conversations. I'd also note that there's another aspect of this that was mentioned several times at the ICANN meeting in Dublin, and that was the internal team that (Acrom Atala) has set up to begin the implementation planning for all the IANA ability issues, particularly in terms of what changes may be forthcoming for ICANN operations.

And by February, that work should have - a little - you know, have some momentum. It might be useful to talk with (Acrom) or (Trang Win), who is the ICANN staffer leading that effort. She's in the Los Angeles office.

And so there may be some value in having a conversation with her, at least getting a brief update from her in terms of how some of that work is going. Thank you, (Rudy). I've got (Tony) and then (Tapani) in the queue. (Tony), I'll turn the mic to you, sir.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thank you, (Rob). It's getting a little bit confusing talking about GNSO structure, but one of the things I think we should add to our list here is to pick up, I think, a lot of these frustrations, a lot of people in this house had with the lack of the GNSO review, looking at the structural issues at all.

So a discussion around some element of that in terms of some of the views which are going to be pretty diverse, I think, across this (house). But getting that discussion going would be - well, it would be the opportunity to do that.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, (Tony). I'll reflect that, too. You're potentially envisioning a session where folks would share their visions and perspectives and that you could all, you know, use that as a jumping off point for some additional conversations, I guess.

Tony Holmes: Well, I think if we could get to basically agree on some principles that needed to be addressed within those discussions that, in itself, would be quite a step forward.

Rob Hoggarth: Awesome. What I'll do is as I start to tease out some of these topics, the structure I'm hoping to use is, we would identify the topic, discussion leaders and flag a goal for each of the areas. And so agreeing on some of the principles I think would be a good start for fashioning a goal for that conversation.

Tony Holmes: Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Is there anything else you wanted to add, (Tony)?

Tony Holmes: No, I think you've captured all of what I wanted to say. Thanks, (Rob).

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. (Tapani), your next on the list, and then (Greg) will be after you.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: It's (Tapani) for the record. Following up a bit on what (Rudy) said, I think we - I was planning actually do have some (talk in there) on the stakeholder group level, the organization and the pre-session meeting, but there's one thing we should (put) together as to how some procedural issues you might like to have (on) how does our house make decisions?

Particularly, I'm thinking about this (unintelligible) process of vice chair election that we might like to have some kind of - a bit more formalized and a streamlined process for that, as well, because it seems to be not so well defined. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. That's a great suggestion and it raises something that's come up in the first two meetings, that put a premium on one of the - for a couple of the recommendations that people provided, which was, can we please get the program agenda done earlier so that we, as meeting attendees, can prepare better?

And if we can achieve my goal - I'm sorry, not your goal - well, I hope it's your goal too, of having a pretty baked program agenda by the end of December, then that would give folks a month to actually be able to think about and prepare for some of these issues.

And to your point, (Tapani), I think this is an important area that is right for some pre-meeting discussions, you know, some pre-work. Granted, that has to be factored in with a lot of CCWG stuff that's going to be going on in January, so I don't know how realistic that which could be.

But the point being, that if a smaller group of you were representatives of your group, could start toying with brainstorming about putting something down on

paper about potentially what processes might look like or ideas that might be there, that might jumpstart and make the face-to-face discussions more productive.

And so I'm just throwing that out there. On that topic that you just mentioned, (Tapani), and any other topic that we think about the potential prospects of having some pre-meeting discussions, meaning January timeframe, that helps prepare for some of this stuff. So thanks for that suggestion, (Tapani). (Greg), your hand is up in your next, sir.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

Greg Shatan: I second (Tapani)'s suggestion that we get back, and maybe actually try to have some closure on the vice chair selection process. We actually spent much of the past year and a rather slow schedule trying to resolve that question.

Do not resolve it but we came very close. And there was a proposal that almost seemed to have been accepted. And then, under the actual circumstances we were dealing with, we quickly tried to do one thing, which was not what the proposal was but what seem to be kind of coordination between the two leadership groups.

And then that turned into apparently some sort of a vote of the counselor. So - which was not necessarily what was contemplated. But I think there is a lot of history behind this and a lot of effort and none of it, you know, comes to fruition.

It'll be nice to see it actually come to fruition if possible, which I think underlined your point that we need to have this agenda out because that will require some preparation and probably some pre-discussion, to actually have some stuff on the table that people could actually decide on or, if necessary, take back to their groups to decide on.

But so far, you know, it's a terrible example in terms of the decision-making process if we can go on for a year, not come to a decision, and then not have people realize we even had that process take place.

So similarly I'm not sure where we're at on making - be able to make a choice for our board seat either. I seem to recall that coming up with (Marcus) was a painful and improvised process and I think that we need to revisit that.

And I think the overall issue of how our two stakeholder groups and the constituencies within them communicate with the other half of the house. It generally seems to be an issue. We did just revive NCPH leadership, email list, but it's - they've been populated very differently on the two sides of the house which I guess is fine, reflects different viewpoints of what's going on.

But, you know, it's unclear how we communicate and how we can possibly make any decisions. We need kind of a better understanding of all of that.
Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you very much. Yes, those are all just, I think, fantastic issues for conversation. I think you're right not to create the expectation that you will necessarily resolve all of those in February, but I think having the conversations beforehand, during and then subsequently perhaps will create a mechanism or process for resolving some of these.

We've got both (Chantel) and (Mariam) on this call, and so throwing this out sort of as a heads up to them as well. You all know that we now have these additional capabilities in terms of support staff.

And I think that we can think about expanding that. I'll take some responsibility for this, more for being ignorant than not for doing anything, but I think that ever since we reached this quote, unquote, "house compromise," several years ago, I think it has generally been a lack of process.

I think in the early days that made some sense. Folks were still, you know, figuring out what they needed to do. But I think you all have cited some examples of the potential benefits of creating some more formalized decision-making structures.

I don't think we're talking about creating completely new bureaucracies. But what I will be more than happy in the substantive discussions about this issue and also in terms of some of the planning, to offer ICANN staff support.

If you all think that, you know, it's time for us to be a little bit more formal with this house, (Rob), can you identify someone who's responsible for helping to coordinate our efforts, someone who, at least, will be a project manager, who has this on their list of accountabilities, who knows that they need to reach out to these groups, provide some timeframes, and at least create a structure for making the decisions.

Whether, you know, you can completely resolve what the precise process is, at least creating that structure to give you all a framework for the conversation, some expectations with respect to timetables and putting things together.

So I don't know is that something that you all would be warm to but I put out that offer here on a recorded call to see them that something that we might be able to explore. (Greg), I see that your hand is still up. I don't know if you had a follow-up comment or it's just an old hand. Thank you, sir.

And I'm noticing, and we're also keeping an eye on the chat here, so thank you all for your various plus-ones showing support for some of these topics. We're getting close to the top of the hour. The only other quick topic that I might throw out to you all is, since the meeting will be only about five weeks before the Marrakesh meeting, you might want to devote a session to that, you know, just in terms of proper planning.

Also, we still have I think an open issue that the GNSO council (what Lars) is dealing with, but I'm sure your individual communities might want to explore, is the ICANN new team B that will be taking place in Panama, and there might be a - some useful opportunities for conversation about sort of what you all want to accomplish, if not just as a house, or if individual communities, sort of as an overall GNSO community in terms of expectations for the meeting (B).

By that time, there may be more an idea of what the structure might look like, but a conversation among all of you about what you might want to accomplish within that relatively new structure, I think would be very useful to consider.

So I will - I collected, and taking copious notes, on the three suggestions that I've gotten. I'll throw in a couple of more just to (feed) the conversation. When I anticipate for those of you who've been on past planning groups, is I create, in addition to the overall sort of view of what this meeting is, I create a working document.

We went through eight versions of it last year which just sort of sets out the framework, some logistical issues, and other matters related to the meeting. Before your next meeting, I will produce that document for all of you and for those who weren't able to attend this call, for you all to start giving the edits on using it as a jumping off point for further conversation.

And will start identifying gaps, and slowly over the next three, four weeks, fill those gaps up via email or another planning call. What I'd like you all to consider - and I don't know if we'll need, but will probably do a Doodle scheduling poll for this.

Recognizing that some folks have holidays coming up, if we could potentially look to the week of December 7th for our next call, potentially that Wednesday or Thursday, around the same time, we would then have your list of delegations.

We would have a lot more information about the hotel. We would've had a week or so for an exchange about potential programming topics. And I think we can use the next call as a way to seeing whatever programming holes we need to fill.

And I'll be getting feedback and know from many of you whether you're planning on doing any pre-meetings. Is there anything else that we should be thinking about in terms of next steps on preparations for the next call? And I appreciate your feedback about the call times, (Tony).

This seems to be the sweet spot. It seems to be either 7:00 - I'm using my own time zone here. I shouldn't do that but from a UTC perspective, either 12:00 or 1:00, UTC, right around 1200 or 1300.

So I think that's the sweet spot to give us the best coverage from all of you. So, no, not the 7th, (Rudy). I'd be looking later in the week, potentially the 9th or the 10th, and (Benedetta) and I will get out with a - some poll to recommend that.

We're reaching the top of the hour. Actually, we have reached it. Is there any other burning issue that anyone would like to raise that we have not touched on that we should?

Hearing nothing and seeing some of the preliminary feedback and the chat, I think we will look for than 8th. The only challenge there is I will be getting off our redeye about an hour and a half before the meeting is scheduled, but I think that should be doable.

So I think that, you know, that's the window that works for everybody. We'll target that. I maybe mobile for part of the call but (Miriam)'s done a great job of getting a set up on this meeting so we'll work on that as our operative next time - Wednesday, the 9th at the same time.

So thank you all very much for joining. We're off to a good start. Our goal is to have this work completed by the end of the third week of December and I think we can do it.

Please, if there are any comments or ideas that occur to you after this call, please drop us a line on the email list. (Benedetta) and I are going to be working on putting together a similar wiki page, with the space, where we'll have the recordings of the calls, the planning calls, and we'll start building out the various documentation items that we're going to need for the meeting.

So when we get that space built, I'll also alert you all to that. Thank you all very much for joining. Look forward to you all getting together again. And, (Greg), thanks for your final comment there. Please, they suggestions on substantive policy issues, please circulate them via email. We'll get them on the list. Thanks everybody. We'll talk to you and about a week and a half, two weeks.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible) cannot stop recording. Thank you very much. Thank you all for attending the meeting. Bye.

END