

ICANN

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
February 3, 2017
8:00 am CT**

Jenny: Recordings have started.

Operator: Thank you very much, Jenny. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the NCSG intersessional planning call on the 3rd of February 2017.

On the call today with Klaus Stoll, Ayden Férdeline, Renata Aquino, Stefania Milan, Tapani Tarvainen, Joan Kerr, Anna Lopu, Rafik Dammak, Julf Helsingius, Ed Morris, Tatiana Tropina, Avri Doria. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking or transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Maryam. So for the record, Tapani speaking. I hope to recognize by voice because I will forget to mention my name in now and then. So you have the agenda items on the screen but basically there are other things that we should decide today and I hope we have time to talk about some substantive issues as well.

So first thing is we want to name which - who from us will be session later discussion leads for the sessions where the commercial side has already decided theirs, so it may make our decisions easier.

There are seven sessions, as you can see. (And I) suggest we just go through them in order, have some here, then I have ideas would like to suggest a second (order) but you may have other ideas.

And you also, the tentative schedule, Rob assigned them more or less randomly to NCUC and NCSG. Yes, we are free to ignore that percent if we want to and (unintelligible) each other, but I guess, tentatively we can start with that (session), but with that - but anybody want to make - suggestions, otherwise, fine.

It's entirely up to us. So let's go through them in order. The first one we have is compliance issues which Rob assigned to NCUC, I note, and yes, we would like someone who is reasonably knowledgeable about the subject, as always.

But possibly also someone who's not going to (fight) too much because the session lead should be also at least slightly neutral, or totally neutral because we have to - the CSG has their own as well. I see, Anna, you have your hand up. I was just about to ask, but go ahead please.

Anna Loup: All right, can you guys hear me okay? This is Anna Loup for the record. Sorry, this is very early here. So I have some background with compliance issues but also I think that that makes me quite neutral since I don't have a lot of very concrete opinions about it so I think I fit the latter category, so I would volunteer for this position.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Anna. Volunteering is something I very much like and I think you would be reasonably qualified for that, as well, for reasons you mentioned and otherwise - but anybody else wants to either volunteer or suggest somebody else or shall we leave this to Anna?

Okay, I see no hands up so that was an easy decision. I have one volunteer and no other suggestions. So will have Anna for the first one. Next we have NPCH, procedural in-house issues.

It mainly means the board members election procedure which has (unintelligible) to NPOC. Stefania, since you're asking, can we volunteer Ed for this, Ed is on the call himself. I don't want you to volunteer him for anything. He can do it himself.

But so going to the second point, the procedural in-house issues, we (starts with really) a board member selection procedure which, the problem there is that our - there was team supposedly planned for that, and from our side there were - it was David Cake and Amr.

Also, Amr is not coming to Copenhagen, Reykjavík at all and David is not on the call in any case, this was suggested for NPOC. Any volunteers, anybody want to do that?

See that we have NPOC members around, Klaus, would you like to (point to someone)? Now I also note that in case there's some - nobody else wants to do it, I guess I'll have to pick up all those. But I'd rather not take too many - actually, I would rather take none at all but I will take whatever is left over. Okay, Klaus, please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: I mean, thank you. Good morning everybody. It's also a little bit early here. Yes, quite happy to take it. It would be nice if you had - basically have two people to do it - to deal with it. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we can only name on as the session lead now...

Klaus Stoll: Okay, then I'm quite happy to do it. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, I suggest you talk (through emails) to Dave and Amr about what they've been doing about that in the past (because if we have)...

Klaus Stoll: Okay, no problem.

Tapani Tarvainen: But we can leave that to Klaus. Okay. Any other opinions? No? Okay. Moving on, next one is the new gTLDs. Klaus, your hand is still up. Is that an old or...

Klaus Stoll: Yes, sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry, I'm writing in doing things.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so new gTLDs. I don't see any hands up. That's something I'm not enough an expert with it so I'd like - may I ask Avri, would you be willing to take that? I see Avri typing, sure, I'm not (unintelligible) (Mike) isn't ready, but check this line. Any other ideas? If not, I believe it's too Avri. Okay, we are - okay, Avri...

Avri Doria: Yes, just a quick thing. This is Avri speaking. I'm willing to do it. I'm just wondering whether having one of the co-chairs of the working group is the right person to lead a session that may want to talk about everything that's wrong with a working group.

So I'm willing to do it. I just, you know, just wanted to bring that point up, that - you know what I mean? There may be a conflict (perspective), but I'm fine doing it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, all. Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Man: Maryam, I can hear you but I can hear anybody else.

Man: I can hear you both.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, that's great. Tapani, can you maybe join the Adobe room again because we can't hear you?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, can you hear me now?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, we can hear you. Thank you everyone.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Okay, at what point did you lose my voice? Now, I was confirming if we have Avri to - if we name Avri for the new gTLD session. Okay, the next one, policy discussion topic, which is a bit difficult we don't really still know what that topic will actually be.

And then they're supposed to be something more from the - about that but I guess we'll have to leave it as open as this and the CSG has named theirs on that.

What somebody be brave enough to pick that without knowing anything more than it some political discussion topic initially I believe suggest must be RPM. If so, then it would like - (Cathy) would be good but she's not here, I see.

Klaus Stoll: Tapani, I would want to hear somebody from NPOC. Maybe Joan can take that. Joan, what do you think about that?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that was (unintelligible). Joan, do you want to take it?

Joan Jerr: Sure. It's a discussion, right, to collect information, correct?

Tapani Tarvainen: We don't know exactly what it would be, but a discussion.

Joan Jerr: Okay, sure. Let's discuss it. Sure, I'd like to do that.

Joan Jerr: Okay, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Jerr: Or Poncelet is our policy person....

Poncelet Ileleji: I just wanted to say, so, I'll be part of it. Poncelet speaking. I'll be part of this. No worries on that.

Tapani Tarvainen: So which one will you want to take? Did you agree on that, Poncelet, Joan?

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Ed, you have the mic. Share an opinion.

Ed Morris: Thanks, Tapani. Yes, I'm pretty sure...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: You guys know the RPC guy, (Mark Trachtenberg), is almost exclusively IPC. He does a very - or IP issues. He does very little else here so I would be very surprised if the policy discussion is anything except IP, so that's what you're getting into.

Tapani Tarvainen: So, Joan, Poncelet, are you up to serious IP discussion?

Joan Jerr: Thanks, Ed, for clearing that up.

Poncelet Ileleji: I will go for it. Poncelet speaking...

Joan Jerr: Poncelet, okay, (go).

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Poncelet first. Go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: Okay, I don't mind, but (Ted) and Joan has volunteered. If he wants to do it, fine. But if she doesn't, I'm familiar with it. Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Joan, do you want to stick to it or you want to drop it to Poncelet?

Joan Jerr: Okay, go ahead. Yes - no, I'll let Poncelet do it because he's a policy person anyway.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Poncelet, you have an interesting job ahead of you then. Anybody else is interested, comments? (Rinalti), (unintelligible) we can swap them if need be, but unless you have (unintelligible) reason to suggest, otherwise, we can keep it easier by speaking to what was suggested, so.

Keep this one, two, Poncelet. And budgeting discussion - this has also been tentatively indeed assigned to NPOC. Do we have someone who really wants

to do that? This is actually for someone who (really has) - takes the time to begin to - the budget and also.

But unfortunately, NPOC's a member in the financial committee. (Sam) is not on the team as a delegate.

Klaus Stoll: We...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: (Sam), on the team, is a delegate. But (Sam) is in Reykjavík. So we could actually swap somebody out for that session and get some in it that is an option.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I actually asked about that from (Robin). He said we can do that but I will presume it will be basically up to us and if the CSG is fine with that, then we can. But otherwise, I'd really like to drop this on Ed is the most notable on budget here, I guess, if NPOC is willing to (hold finalization) here.

Klaus Stoll: I would support Ed wholeheartedly. No problem (with NPOC).

Tapani Tarvainen: Ed is the chair of the finance committee so he should be kind of a natural (unintelligible) from him. And I see Ed volunteering as well. So shall we give this one to Ed?

Okay, next one is maintaining GNSO traditional policymaking leadership position. I believe this was drafted by Kathy and (Fazi) if I remember correctly so - but for - not for NCUC, I know, but still if NCUC is happy to have Kathy there even if she's technically on an NCSG (slot).

And I'm assuming she's willing, but I understood that she would be even though she's not present here. Shall we leave this to Kathy? Ed, please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, Tapani, I think Kathy, at least, and what I think we both got messages from her, both of us did. I think she's interested in participating in the debate more than she is in sharing the debate. Does that make sense? I know she's written to both of us and a few other people. Is that what you took from that or maybe I'm misunderstanding?

Tapani Tarvainen: I got the understanding that she did make it - put out one thing to do with the compliance session.

Ed Morris: Okay, I misunderstood that. That's fine.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Renata, you have your hand up.

Renata Aquino: Yes, hi, Renata here. Yes I would definitely say that Kathy should be on the ticket for that asking too, for NCC, as well, since we cannot come to the meeting and this was the product they both made and I would be willing to assist in whatever role necessary also. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I'm looking at Kathy's message on the list were she wanted to work with whoever wants to (co-chair) compliance but co-chair the (ARC) and policy sessions.

So that becomes that, then I should have Poncelet talk with her, but she would especially like to co-chair this (unintelligible) policymaking session later. She said that she doesn't want (the compliance). So I understand she's willing. Ed, your hand is still up. Ed, is that an old hand? Okay.

So I propose we give Kathy this, maintaining that precious policymaking thing. And that leaves (Rhonda) presenting. That's not for NCSG but NPOC has just given up on.

So if you want to take it over, someone from NPOC, I'm happy to hand it over to you, otherwise other suggestions? Do you want to do it? Anybody? I see that Stefania says that she can fill in. I take it you're volunteering for everything. Is that correct or do I have to do it myself?

Klaus Stoll: Come on, NPOC.

Tapani Tarvainen: Hello, Klaus. You want to take that or you have someone from NPOC taking it?

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I'm just cheering on my team. I'm just trying to volunteer somebody.

Tapani Tarvainen: Oh, okay.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, Joan is commenting.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan says she can assist. The question, Stefania, now, is the last session the NCPH presenting, the discussion of roles and expectations of the house and respectively the NPOC roles and GNSO council vice-chairs and ICANN board members (and other issues).

So this is kind of the future of NCPH. Also the future of the (intersessionals), I think will be discussed here, whether we want them or not and what they should be like and so forth.

So does someone want to take the lead on this? Saying that can assist or can fill in does not really count as - okay, Stefania - I can do this. It sounds good to me.

Or, Joan, do you want to do instead, saying you can assist? We don't have two stick into the NCUC, NPOC, NSG assignments here if we don't want to. It's entirely up - but I would, of course, if NPOC is happy to give it up, that's fine.

So Joan, do you want to do it or you want to rather have Stefania do it? Saying you can do it is not enough. Okay, we'll add it to Joan. And that concludes the list of session leads. Maryam, you've got them all.

Just noting that it should really be - make sure that you talk with other people at the participating planning piece, in particular, Poncelet with Kathy, Joan - Klaus will have a talk with Dave and Amr.

Of course, we can also (give) (unintelligible) on the list if we need to. I guess that's it for these. The best thing we'll have to talk about our broker sessions, first, how we want to break them up.

We have a Tuesday morning session. In particular, what we need to decide there is do NCUC and NPOC want to have their own meetings at this time or shall we do this as all NCSG sessions?

I'm presuming the latter, but if you want to have your own constituency-based sessions, I'm not going to stop in your way - stand in your way there. Then we have this question for Tuesday morning, introductory breakout, and we have Tuesday afternoon when Göran is talking to CSG.

We have time for ourselves. And Thursday, all together. Okay, Renata, you're next. Please go ahead.

Renata Aquino: Hi, Tapani. Renata here. I just noticed in the schedule that there's 1-1/2 hours in the beginning which is for groups to convene, something like that. I was wondering if this would be a time we had a plan or, like, take a roll call. You know, airports these days come you never know when people are going to arrive so, yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that's exactly right, and we're talking about right now. So that Tuesday morning, introductory breakout sessions would be - a quick question. Is there somebody will not be there at that time, somebody arriving on Tuesday morning so (unintelligible) morning or something.

As I understand, most people will be coming on Monday already. No? Okay, Tuesday morning breakout, I guess, unless somebody has other ideas, that would be really sort of a general planning, roll call, check everybody and in and talk about what's coming up ahead and plan for the plenary session ahead.

So, seeing no other opinions, let's do that. So that Tuesday morning community breakout session will be just for NCSG all together, preparing for what's up. I don't have a detail - anybody, a detailed agenda at this point, but I expect we will really not need one.

Of course, we will have to - that will be a good time to talk about sessions of the day for anything we - I suspect we will, by that time, have something - ideas about what's going to happen.

And I think also that the first planning session which is supposed to happen - (unintelligible) presentations by each constituency. I assume NCUC and NPOC will have theirs ready and I will try to figure out something for NCSG.

So the Tuesday morning is just a general NCSG planning for the days ahead. The second breakout is there - evening, Göran's - after we (unintelligible) Göran, will have an hour and 10 minutes, I think (17 minutes).

Again, do NCUC or NPOC have their own plans for that time? No? Okay, so I (presume that's also will be) all NCSG session. I don't think we need much more of an agenda that point other than seeing what happened during the day.

That would be just talking with Göran or in the previous (sessions), so putting them together. It's possible as they note in the schedule that we could invite some ICANN staff person, if need be. We want to talk with someone in particular. Maryam.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes. Hi, Tapani. Thanks. I just wanted to find out what the conclusion is on Wednesday. I didn't hear you're properly. Is it going to be on the SG level or (CS)?

Tapani Tarvainen: The stakeholder group level and NCSG, altogether, Wednesday morning.

Maryam Bakoshi: All right. Thank you very much.

Tapani Tarvainen: And it seems that way as well on that (unintelligible) second half when Göran is talking with the commercials, we'll have an hour with each other talking about whatever we messed up.

Renata, as far as I know, the one NCUC session planned is for the first day, but - no, okay, Ed, you have your hand up.

Ed Morris: Yes, thanks, Tapani. They might just want to invite Glen into one of the sessions if she's going to be there. And maybe - she's now a consultant and she's been around from day one.

Maybe we can try to get some advice from her on how we can be more effectively than ICANN, something like that, a more general topic, if we're looking to bring a staff member in. I thought she might be the most appropriate one and most useful for us.

Tapani Tarvainen: And she will be in Reykjavík, I understand, yes. So should we bring her in on this afternoon session after (we hear Yuron), or in the morning or both?

Ed Morris: I would suggest after Göran because we're going to need the first session - at least in my view, to plan questions for the CEO because we want to be very prepared going into that meeting, I would suggest.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Okay, Klaus, you have your hand up.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, thank you. I would like to make deficit suggestion. I think that Glen is playing such a pivotal and directing role in ICANN and her position at the moment is not clear to me and I think it would - I would not be very comfortable with having her in the room.

Tapani Tarvainen: So what would you want us to talk during that time that would make her - Glen's presence - and what ICANN - I see there are some topics it would not be appropriate, but for others it would be. But I would like to have an idea what we will be (talking about).

Klaus Stoll: If you're asking me, quite frankly, I think we are in a situation with the intersessional that there are so many topics in so many things which are coming up that we basically just could use the space for (mopping up) and discovering things which just turned up and where in basic - and proceed.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so we'll have that. At that point, is there anybody else we might want to have? There are several - I think three board members in Reykjavík - (Marcos), (George) and (Renalia) we may want to invite to some of our sessions. I think we want them at least at some of them but not all.

So a question at this point, would people be - want them present in the morning session, the afternoon session or maybe a Wednesday session or all of them, having them listen and or being able to talk with them or try to keep them out if we want to talk something that we don't want them to hear?

And yes, Erika Mann and you, as well, of course, technically outside of ((unintelligible)) from NCSG so we have to decide if we want them present or not in our sessions. Yes. Ed.

Ed Morris: Yes, Tapani, building upon what Klaus said, actually I'm fine with where anybody goes with this. They just want to make sure we actually have something to talk about in that session.

When we have the point where we were going to be speaking about the selection of the board (seat), when we're going to be discussing that with the CSG, I wonder if we - it will be possible to make sure the board members themselves are not in the room for that session.

Klaus brought up a very good point, which is that there are some things we're not going to want certain people from the outside to be in as we talk about it. I certainly don't want to be talking about the selection of the next board member when (Mark) gets - is in the room.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, we - I think we - that applies - I think will have to be talking about the board member selection both within NCSG only and then in the public session and it would be rather understandable that we should ask that (Marcus) not be present when we talk about that. Ed, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand?

Okay, so how about Ulrich and Erika, is there anything that we don't want them to be hearing? Anything we especially do want them to be talking about? As far as ICANN (can tell), I would see no problem telling them then, please come to any and all of our sessions if you want, but you may have other ideas. Ed?

Ed Morris: Yes, for - when we speak about the board member, I don't think it's appropriate for Erika to be there as she's a former member of the board and she has relationships with her former colleagues.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. That does make sense. Maryam, your hand is up. Is that on purpose? Anyway, as we noted, we don't have to decide this on the spot. What we do need to decide is what kind of a (unintelligible) together as an all NCSG level.

And I think we agreed on that one. The both Wednesday sessions, the morning and afternoon, will be NCSG meetings. We don't need to break out for constituencies.

And the Wednesday morning, likewise, does either NCUC or NPOC plan to have their own meetings during that 1-1/2 hours on Wednesday morning? It doesn't sound like it so I guess that's also an all NCSG session.

And I don't see that we need to have a detailed agenda here either. What we need to decide at some point, not necessarily now, is if we're going to invite (unintelligible) NCAs are some staff members on some of the sessions that we can decide that later on at this point.

But we need to decide (unintelligible) which, again, how do we break up? So all of these are on the NCSG level, I'm fine with that and we can move these issues on these points on the list and discuss them later.

But at least we have some issues identified already where we want or don't want certain people present, the board member selection, (unintelligible) one. Are there other issues that are obviously sensitive or possibly sensitive enough that we should consider where we don't want board members or NCAs present?

Okay, if somebody can think of something later, please feel free to note in on the list or otherwise. Actually, it occurs to me that we might want to specifically have a discussion with the board members about the board member selection, a separate discussion from our own at some point because that getting the feedback from the board to viewpoint might be useful.

Or in general, have a specific session talking with board members about how - the direction between board and GNSO board and NCSG and how they feel about us and how we could better work with them on feedback.

So some of these breakout sessions, we should allow for that. Okay, looking at people typing. And actually likewise, the NCS may want to talk about what - how they see their role and how we could better use them or work with them over (there).

So at some point some of these breakout sessions, will have to find time for that. If anybody has any suggestions whether we should do it early on or later on, but I suspect it would be - the first ones, at least, the Tuesday, we would probably meet for talking about (informational) topics and stuff (unintelligible) talk civilly with the CSG.

Maybe so - maybe the Wednesday morning one, but we can leave that until later. (Yule), what depends on who is in the room - reading from the chat? At least when we track that. Okay, yes, talking about the role of the NCS with them and without them actually.

Both might be appropriate but I agree we would certainly want to talk (with you). When we read that one point, them will throw you out and discuss (with you). That makes sense or something like that.

Okay. Okay, now throwing out what - we might politely ask him to leave the room at some point. Okay, Renata, you have your hand up. Speak for a change.

Renata Aquino: Yes, Tapani, I'm just trying to understand here, if we could have a time to carve out to talk to boards and NCA, it doesn't need to be the same time. It could be different topics.

And also maybe I wanted to hear from you what you think could also be topics we could discuss with him and Erika and this opportunity. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, of course we'll talk with the board and NCS about their roles at separate times. The reason - Avri is asking that we might want to exclude them (unintelligible) point.

Yes, it might be, at least in the case of the board members, it might be (unintelligible) too much insiders in some ways, especially Erika, who's been also a former board member.

I don't really see the need or big problem. I'm happy to talk openly with everybody listening including board members and we can just ask them, but I'm happy either way.

But if anybody feels that it's uncomfortable to talk about the board member selection when the board members are present, then I kind of understand that even though I would not mind.

Also, I note that at least (George) and (Renalia) have told me that they want to learn more about (how) NCSG is doing, so I presume they will be available for us more rather than the CSG if we want to whenever we want them.

But certainly that time when Göran is talking with the CSG, that would be a time when they will not be with the CSG anyway. So that would be an easy time to invite them in.

And otherwise in our sessions, if we are uncomfortable with them listening in, I wouldn't be, but if anybody really feels that way, then, I kind of understand that we would have to agree with what to do especially when we're talking about the board member selection. It might be - we might want the time about them.

But we don't have to decide that now. But anyway, that's - we can leave until later. It's a tentative discussion at this point. Anyway, we have, I understand, agreed that all these Tuesday, Wednesday breakouts are the NCSG level, if not NCUC (unintelligible) their own.

So which leaves us Thursday morning which definitely is intended to have a post-meeting community day, as it were, and then (unintelligible) sessions, I understand.

But - and we can - your agendas for those are yours to decide what we have the NCSG session, when, as well, which is those NCSG delegates who are neither the NCUC nor (NPOC).

We would like to rather separately and we have one obvious (agenda) item, we like to have because, in case the council call that same day, the first day planning for that. Sorry about that. Maryam, you have my draft agenda for Thursday?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, I do. One second, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, anyway, see, it's the first part at least, the NCUC and NPOC talking within their own (ECs) so that would be an appropriate time for counselors to talk about the counselor session in the afternoon.

I believe this is such a time in the early morning UTC that (Rafik) would be awake and hopefully would be able to participate remotely. (Rafik), is that correct? (Unintelligible).

Because we have the policy call in the previous week because of this (session) and also any last-minute preparation for the council call the - this would be a

good time for that. Okay, (Rafik), maybe you can at least listen in depending. Ed, you have your hand up again. Please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Sorry, Tapani. I know I had requested some time for the finance committee to meet and Maryam was working on that. I just wanted to know anything came with that.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Ed. Yes, we have that on the schedule.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Ed Morris: Thanks, (Maryam).

Tapani Tarvainen: Where did you put it? (Maryam), when was that on the schedule?

Maryam Bakoshi: So it's at - between 10:00 and 12:00, 10:00 to 12:00.

Tapani Tarvainen: On Thursday?

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry, that - I'm sorry, 9:00 to 9:45 on Thursday. My mistake, 9:00 to 9:45 on Thursday.

Ed Morris: And thanks. And hopefully we can get word to (Sam) that - so he can come into that meeting if he's available, Klaus. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Okay, that's missing from this draft agenda here that we have on the finance committee, meeting there and because this is the NCSG (internal), it will be no problem doing (unintelligible) there so (Sam) will be obviously welcome and needed and everybody else who wants to participate or just listening to what the Finance Committee is doing, is of course, also welcome.

So that will be part of this Thursday session for NCSG. Then towards the later - on the other two items, (unintelligible) just basically (time and I) hope that the NCUC and NPOC members may be able to join the AC meetings.

We (will be) talking about what happened in the intersessional, what went wrong, what we should have done better, whatever, so looking back on that and (kind of last) than looking at what we're going to do with the Council and NCSG policy work in the future.

Maybe talk about Copenhagen or whatever. If someone he has something specific they want to put on the agenda already, that we know we want to talk care, you're welcome.

At this point, I would actually like to ask the NCUC and NPOC how long do you plan your sessions to be in the morning? Are you able to join the NCSG session at some point? Do you have any ideas? Klaus, please.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Tapani. We are - basically we are planning actually Thursday as long as we can as an NPOC session because we - literally we have an eleven point draft agenda.

And we actually - we will meet our time to get as many things covered as possible. So we will try to participate but at the moment, I don't think we can guarantee it.

We are really (playing) the tactic ourselves free to the NCSG during the intercession all and having the Thursday as basically an NPOC day.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I hope you can spare (Sam) for the finance committee session.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, definitely, definitely. That's not a problem. We will also try to be at least - have one person present and other discussions, but basically we see it, as I said, as an NPOC day.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, well, it's nothing particularly critical on this discussion. Most important probably is the initial council talk and only the counselors need to be present. So that should not be an issue. But if anybody has ideas what to do, we should move the discussion to the (Blue Lagoon) or whatever, by all means, suggest that.

Okay, any other business? Does anybody at this point already want to talk about the substance of any of these sessions we are facing where we will have trouble or expect a fight or have fun with CSG or anything like that? Ed, please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, Tapani. I think the question of the future of the intercessions is probably one we're going to be split on. I've been authorized to say that (Fazi) and (Milton) both are opposed to continuing with this meeting.

I'm going to be opposed it (and will) raise that. I'll just - want to point out, there are going to be some differences next year and that the Council is going to have a retreat.

I know the NCUC is putting a supplemental (unintelligible) (request for retreat). And if we keep going with the intersessional, a few of us may, with the face-to-face meeting, we may be asked to give up six weeks of our lives for ICANN and that's just not sustainable.

So I'll be opposed to it. I know the other two have told me to use their names and say that they don't want to continue with the meeting. But I also know there are folks in our community that really like this meeting.

So I think we should at least talk about this and how to present it to the CSG and try to sort out a way for how we decide what to do going forward, whether we should throw it to our ECs, because I don't think us as a group should make that decision - and how we should handle that question which will be coming up on the last day.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for that, Ed. Of course we can also think about the future of the intersessional in a rather (radical) out-of-the-box ways. We don't have to do it like this. We can call it the intersessional and still is the time and a number of different ways if we need be.

But (unintelligible) this one key topic for discussion is what we're going to do with - do we want any meeting outside of the three main ICANN meetings? And if so, what should they be?

Should we really talk with the CSG or should we maybe have alternating years with the registries and registrants or whatever? Anyway, Renata, you have your hand up.

Renata Aquino: Yes, hi. Renata here. So (it seems the last) June sessions maintaining the GNSO's traditional policymaking leadership and NCPH presenting. And I remember we thought that this could maybe be also about roles.

So I'm just trying to understand here the differences between these two sessions, what should we expect and the flow between them. Like, also I understand, of course, Kathy will (unintelligible) to this proposal, but I was

trying to understand the overlap of that last one and if this could be (polemic) or not. Just a comment. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Renata. Yes, of course, the future of the (enrolls) or the house, whether NCPH actually is anything but a working structure or whatever, is part of the discussion and that has an effect on whether this kind of intersessional meeting is useful or if another kind of meeting would be more useful or whether we should do it (here) or we could do it all together.

So it's starting with that, it's and (unintelligible) beside the three big ones useful at all, and if so, what it should be like. And should we have - well, many people note that we should sometimes talk with registries and registrants and we are organizing meetings with them in Copenhagen, by the way.

But even this kind of longer intersessional type of thing - or should we just drop everything? So this is one big discussion, (topically) and one we should really talk with each other amongst ourselves in advance, as well, with all of our ECs and discussion lists and so forth. Ed, go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, thanks, Tapani, I just - to try to - to summarize the difference between the two sessions, you can see where it came out of. When you're looking at the one that Kathy's going to be chairing, I think the issues we're going to be looking at there are things like staff making policy by contracts, the advisory committee, perhaps, doing things that someone say - and I'm not sure I agree with this - that have in the past been a (propriety) of the SOs.

And the perception that there is a reduced role for the GNSO and the overall policy scheme in ICANN, I'm not sure I yet agree with all this. I agree with some of it, but I think that's where that discussion leads.

The second discussion came out of a proposal by Greg which was a response to a post that I made on lists basically stating that all the MCPHs, that it's an aggregation method, at these meetings and even the thoughts that we have things more in common with the CSG than we do with the registrars and registers just is not true.

And so I think what Greg's intention, when we started putting this part together, in lieu of another discussion about structure, was to try to define what the NCPH is, what - is that what I believe it is, which is just a voting mechanism (plus) the requirement to work together and selection of the boards and the vice chair.

Or is it something more, whereas the first session is more about the role of the GNSO as a whole in the ICANN ecosphere so I just hope that helps clarify it a bit, at least as I understand it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Ed. Yes, that's more or less how I understood it, as well, at the last session. It's really about NCPH and whether we need better all. I guess we need that as a means of selecting NCH, if nothing else, and the board member, but doesn't need to be any sort of (unintelligible) meeting? Okay, anything else on this or any other topics to bring...

Kathy Kleinman: Tapani, this is Kathy Kleinman. I'm joining by audio and I've been in the background for a little bit.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I trust you noticed that we pick you up as a discussion lead for the last (unintelligible).

Kathy Kleinman: I'm sorry, I'm having trouble hearing.

Tapani Tarvainen: That we made you a co-chair for that GNSO (traditional policy) meeting session.

Kathy Kleinman: Okay, terrific. And I think that's one will have a lot in common with the CSG on. I think there is a real dilution of GNSO power and I think they'll - and it's already in policymaking and I think we'll find a lot of agreement with them on that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you, Kathy. Anything else anybody? Is there really anything we don't really expect to have a serious fight with CSG on or do we want to say that at this point? Ed, you have the floor.

Ed Morris: It's going to be compliance. That's where, in my view, the most important session of all is going to be compliance as Jaime Hedlund is going to be there. He's new on the job.

That's why I'm really happy Anna is doing it, is she knows - I think she's a little bit modest and what she knows having interned in ICANN and having worked on a lot of the CCT issues, she knows this.

But basically since - the five years I've been here, the principal goal of the business constituency, and for some of the IDC, has been you increase the amount of money given to compliance and you increase compliance.

Our perspective has always been we don't want an incredibly active ICANN compliance department because they get them into content. So I think that's really, in my view, the most important session of the two days and it's the one we need to be prepared for. And it's the one where there's going to be conflict.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you for that, Ed. So we are expecting a difficult debate on the compliance.

Kathy Kleinman: Tapani, this is Kathy. May I join the queue?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, go ahead, Kathy. You're next. There's nobody up.

Kathy Kleinman: Okay. I'm not sure it has to be adversarial. But we certainly have a different view on compliance than CSG does. And we started the discussion really in Hyderabad. We probably should have started it much earlier.

The compliance has been completely one-sided. So, for example, we talked to the board in Hyderabad as part of our NCSG meeting. One of the points we presented was that WHOIS, WHOIS compliance and being taken without regard to who they are, without regard to whether they've even identify themselves.

Anonymous complaints can be taken and they can be for purposes of harassment. They can be for purposes of going after students who said something they don't like.

And that if there's a typo or if there's not a cell phone because the student doesn't have a cell phone, domain names are taken down. So I'm not sure we have to fight the CSG. I think we have to explain to Jaime Hedlund that we really want fair and valid compliance and we don't want anonymous complaints.

We want to be able to investigate who's complaining. We want registrants to have right to legal action in case they're being harassed. This isn't just me saying this. (John Berryhill) has logged this actively.

He represents a lot of registrants and UDRPs and he's finding that if they can get the domain name through a UDRP, they'll file an anonymous WHOIS complain. That's insane.

Compliance has to be much - everybody, I apologize. I'm at National Airport in DC, so I apologize for the noise in the background. Anyway, thank you. That - I don't think we have to fight the CSG. I just think we have to explain to Jaime that we want a lot more fair and balanced compliance and enforcement and we don't want harassment of registrants. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Kathy. Yes, whether it's - of course we don't want to be any more antagonistic then we need to be but be prepared for having a difference of opinion here they may take some explaining. Let's put it like that.

Anybody else have anything? Anywhere where we expect to have trouble or need extra preparation for? I think we should really (try to) prepare for all of this, but if there's anything else that you want to bring up at this point, this would be a good time.

Organizational - or reorganizational issues. Let's see, (I'm pointing in the chart here). Avri, what you clarify and what - do you have something specific in mind here about the NCPH or the GNSO level or something completely different?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Well, we've just had these discussions are ongoing with CSG at times about, you know, their desires on various reorganizational parts of GNSO, GNSO Council, their separate GNSO management that has got Council, all of that stuff that they keep bringing in may get brought in again.

So that's just another area where I think we have a conflict with them. I don't think we've gotten on the bandwagon that they started about, you know, the Council is just policy and we need a separate management structure for the GNSO.

So I know that something that I certainly don't want to see us go down the road on. And every time we get together with them, that topic does seem to rear its head. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Ed, you have the floor.

Ed Morris: Yes, I agree with Avri in terms that we need to be wary about this at exactly in terms of the policy. We did a good job in negotiating the agenda and making sure we didn't have a session on this which is what the CSG wanted, for those who weren't here in the earlier stages.

However, when I saw Steve DelBianco's name is the co-chair of the last session, I expect they will probably do exactly what Avri has said and bring this issue up again, so we do need to be prepared for that. And if we have to go down that road again, that's really a sad state of affairs because every meeting, every interaction always comes back to that. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that's a good point. So Joan (must) be prepared for this and try to take care that the discussion doesn't veer too much in that direction (since) you are co-chairing that session.

Anybody else? Any other issues? Okay, it sounds like - we're done in just over one hour. Okay. One more call for any other business (or shall) we retire for the weekend? Okay, that was it.

Woman: Thank you, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you everybody and let's continue on the list and I don't think we have time or need for another such call but if it turns out to be, we will consider that later. But, for now, let's close this. Thank you everybody. Goodbye. Have a good weekend.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone. Jenny, you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you, everyone, for participating in the meeting today. Have a great weekend. Bye.

END