

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
April 7, 2016
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings are now started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Gino. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.
This is the NCSG EC meeting on Friday 7th of April 2017 at 1300 UTC. On the call today we have Tapani Tarvainen, Joan Clark, Robin Gross, Poncelet Ieleji, Monika Zalneriute. And from staff we have myself Maryam Bakoshi. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Maryam. So this is Tapani speaking. We have – okay the agenda, the screen membership applications, the number of removal procedures and the analyst discussion and request. And this is the first time we'll be using that new membership application database interface here. And it is still a bit work in progress as it were. As noted that this team working on this I think Joan start wanting to have their public interface pretty first and left the - this the internal parts later. And this definitely still needs some at least rough corners polished but I hope we can get by with it.

I trust everybody has found it now. The link is on the chat and everybody seems to be. So let's look at the individuals list first. Note if you look at there's found some issues and related to that there is no horizontal scrollbar. So if you have a big font and a small screen you may not see the all of the columns. So if that happens you have just to shrink the font or find a bigger screen I guess. So let's have a look at the individuals first. So click on the NCSG Membership Applications Individual if you haven't go there already.

Let me see the first one (Ardibomi Akinbal) an individual registered in his own domain name which is (Akinbal Bajini).

Now I'm missing one key field here. Why is that? Okay the interest statement is simply a list of items education, mobilization rights and applications privacy matters. Yes it is (unintelligible) no reference no affiliated NCSG member. There is a domain name. There's a LinkedIn page that has a Twitter handle. Opinions, comments anyone? It seems that his domain is actually simply redirects to his LinkedIn page but it does work. So comments? Shall we go in order Joan?

Hello. I see Monika commenting that it looks weird. And in case you want to you can – if you click on the name of the applicant column see the whole details given that some of them are missing. You know, but there isn't much - actually there isn't anything else in this particular case. But this LinkedIn page does indicate he works for the Nigeria Internet Registration Association or is associated with anyway. And I see Poncelet commenting that you know something about well-being - working for registrar does not immediately disqualify him but it would require some explanation as to why his interest - what kind of noncommercial interest he has. So in general we have not made a hard rule that and his employer would disqualified him regardless of that at least. But in case of employer is in the DNS business somehow or register

registrar it would require an explanation as to how it of any or why it have what noncommercial interest they had.

So I guess reading that everybody's here in the chat it's suggesting we ask for explanation so that's what we'll do. Maryam please send him an email asking for an explanation what is his noncommercial interest in the gTLD policy. Are we in agreement here? Okay nobody wants to speak but in the chat Poncelet wants to speak. Please go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes Poncelet speaking for the record. So within the database we have what do we replace. We place the attending since we're acting for more information?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes we'll put him in the pending category then and wait for his reply.

Poncelet Ileleji: Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: The database has category set. it's a category just for the purpose. Robin please.

Robin Gross: Thanks. I just have a question about marking or the evaluation remarks on to this database. The very last column on the right of evaluation community comments and it looks like there's a box there that we can type things into. Are we – is that what we're supposed to type if we individually approve or have a question? Or is that something that the final or the group decision will be put into that box? I'm just kind of wondering if I need to be typing things into that box or not?

Tapani Tarvainen: That's a good question. Actually that was the original intent but it seems that there is a little glitch in this that it's several people filling it at the same time and then saved only the latest one remains. So at least during this call let's

have Maryam fill that in for us. But the intent is that well actually have to work on how this I – but we hoping basically we'll have checkbooks for each of you to approve and so forth but for now let's just put them – as you can see in the below in some of the - of course not all of them are this are pre-filled entry for our opinions there. But for now during this call let's now have Maryam fill that in. Maryam whatever you do please click Save every now and then so we can do which you've done because it does not reflect on there until you save it. But we have agreed. I take it that Mr. (Ardibomi Akinbal) will have to explain is commercial interest so leave him pending.

Next is from India (Oliverbad Malira Bashudakurar). I'm probably mispronounced it horribly but I trust you know we're talking about an individual user without a domain name. a cyber security research and privacy loss (unintelligible). My aim is to have Internet neutral IT and support for freedom of expression with healthy discussion democratically. No domain name, no LinkedIn page. And just that he heard about the NCSG from conference but doesn't say which conference. Comments, opinions? Joan please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Hi. it's Joan for the record. This is one that he's a researcher but perhaps asked what his - if he has the other contact information or what (unintelligible) because a lot of times researchers don't but he may be associated with a University for example and ask - just ask for more information.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay I see Joan agreeing. Anybody objecting? Monika you raised some positive likewise. So again we'll ask Maryam please email him asking for more information, any Web sites or reference or anything on it in addition to. Note that we would like to have a Web page or LinkedIn reference or something that we can see what he's been doing. And he's asking for is research.

Next (Teadro Kavales) from Brazil, again an individual without domain name. He's a member of Cross Community Working Party on ICANN's corporate and social responsibility to respect human rights and director (unintelligible) was it IT policymaking 2005 when he founded NGOs (unintelligible) in Brazil. He refers (Carlos Alfonzo) and a board member of CGI.BR.
Comments, opinions anyone? Others? Joan please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Yes it same reason, you know, we need more information. But it sounds - he doesn't have a Web site but it sounds pretty good so to me. I don't know if we want to ask for more information so that you're clear but it sounds pretty good to me that it's okay. So it's okay with we if we don't need more information.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay we do have that reference. We could of course check with (Carlos) if he actually even knows him but ask with him or if any others you can also type your approval or disapproval on the chat if you like -- whatever is easiest.
Okay Robin approving, Poncelet.

Okay it seems everybody is agreeing. I will agree as well so let's approve Mr. (Kavales) I presume it's Mr. Actually I'm not sure. Oh well (Teadro Kavales)'s approved.

Next (Clair Craig) from Trinidad and Tobago, employed or a member of a large commercial organization. It's too complicated to elect a standing to get an organization to join on an organizational basis. That's an unusual one but fine in principle. ICT researcher, interest in ICT for development. (Unintelligible) doing a PhD in social policy on looking at Internet exchange pointed to Caribbean. And I don't see any indication of which that organization is. So I think it would be reasonable to ask. And there is no Web site, no LinkedIn page either.

Okay I see that Robin and Joan are at least Joan is saying that we should ask for more info. Any objections to that? No. I guess we will do that. So Maryam ask for more info and specifically ask for which is that large organization it's referring to. I see some people typing. Yes Robin that is a very good point. That's something we should clarify the application from. Maryam please make a note of that when we have our next meeting when we go out - mean that about fixing this. While improving this member application form we can get put that on the agenda, clarify the text yes. But we'll leave Ms. (Craig) and pending until we get more information.

Next (Andrea Russo) from Romania. An individual Internet user without domain has started to become interested in in Internet governance during my master program on information and communication technology law at that University of Oslo encouraged by my Internet Governance Professor Dr. Lee (unintelligible) to apply for the NE. I guess that to (amounts to) NCSG and cross reference Stephanie Perrin. No Web page, no LinkedIn page.

No Poncelet looking at your comment in the chat. You don't have to be anything as long as Maryam gets the next note about what needs to be doing. So for the time being we'll just let Maryam handle that. Any comments on (Andrea Russo)? Robin seems approving of this. Joan, Poncelet approving, Monika. Okay let's approve Andrea Russo. We trust that Stephanie is also recommending and it's good enough.

Next is (Hamid Cayard) from Chad. We don't have too many Chadian members from Chad I believe. An individual member referencing to the (ISOC) Chad working at the office researcher assistant to international research for development and volunteer lecturer at the University of N'Djamena. And through my work I help contribute to the creation of

informed and interconnected youth that use social media presume. But the check is that form actually cuts this explanation short or something because it seems to couple of (unintelligible).

Cut half in half. Maryam please make a note of that. We'll have to check with - if there is a problem in the application from an eclipse basis. And there is Web site and LinkedIn page. Comments, opinions? Robin is approving. Poncelet, Monika approving.

And Poncelet says you know him personally. That's good. So oh yes Joan I almost missed it which about time you talk. Anyway everybody supporting him. I concur, we'll approve him.

Next (Alastair Stretchan) from the Netherlands, an individual user with his own domain. Apply to join EURALO after attending ICANN 58 as a fellow as (unintelligible) at which stakeholder group within the community the more I discovered the more I realized that my real interest is around the end-user representation engagement and diversity, reference Tatiana Tropina.

Okay robin you met him. You approve him as a member? So Robin approving. Others? Joan approving, Poncelet approving, Monika, okay everybody approving. I'll concur. We'll approve (Alastair Stretchan).

Next is (Bryson Karmac), an individual user with from registry in the (policy side) but explanation simply I'm an altruist at heart. There is a Web site. Does it work? Any comments on Mr. (Karmac)?

The Web site looks interesting. But it does not really provide all that much data there. Yes okay it seems we need to ask for more information because that Web site is - does not really tell much and we have no understanding of

what his interest in there. gTLD policy isn't in whether it's non-commercial not so. Ask for more information. Maryam please make a note of that.

Now let's look at the next one, (Bruna Santos) from Brazil, individual user fellowship alumni with a background in governmental issues and policy making duties so experienced both with working with IT related issues within the Brazilian government. For the past three years worked as a legal advisor of the Presidency of the Republic of Brazil. It sounds governmental but it's a LinkedIn page what does it look like? Opinions, comments on this one?

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Yes Robin please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes I'm a little bit of two different minds on this one. On the one hand when you look at the experience it is all in government and you think well gee maybe this person doesn't properly belong in the - belongs in the GAC. But then, you know, you look a little closer it's like well, you know, this is I guess a very young person who may be got their initial experience in government and I don't want to hold that against them. Renata's listed as a reference so, you know, that kind of gives me hope as well. I just I'm just wondering if we want to maybe contact this person and say now you understand this is not a governmental thing that you need to be here to advocate for noncommercial public interest and this isn't a part of your job right and just make sure there's that kind of a understanding or awareness or I don't know maybe that's going too far and we don't need to do that I'm - because I'm just a little bit on the fence here, you know, because I want to give this person the benefit of the doubt and say let's give it a shot but then I also don't want to set a precedent of, you know, starting to let people who work for government in. So I don't

know. I'm a little bit on the fence here. I'd like to hear what other people think on this. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: A note that you look - I trust you have seen the LinkedIn page but anyway Joan you want to speak.

Joan Kerr: I have – I think that the experience is just government but they're applying for the noncommercial because they have the experience. So I have no problem with it and I think again because Renata recommended - is the recommender - recommendation I think that she could explain to that person what the NCSG is about so I personally think we should - I personally would approve him.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Joan. I note that on her LinkedIn page is that she's an independent researcher in Internet governance and human rights. And the reference is at University, Center in (unintelligible) de Brasília. So but not currently working for the government. So I see Joan approving, Robin's persuaded. I see that if I understand correctly Monika approves as well and Poncelet is typing.

Okay Poncelet approves him as well. So it seems we are in agreement. Let's approve (Bruno Santos). And I must note in this connection that Renata has been really effective in recruiting new members. But that's as an aside.

Moving on we have (Adella Bodella) from Belgium, an individual without governing currently working in research regarding children abuse and exploitation on the cyberspace and doing research regarding Internet governance ICANN and the organization with the capability of shaping Internet policies. Referenced Stefania Milan. And there's a LinkedIn page as well.

Comments, opinions? Robin seems to approve. The LinkedIn page says that Project Manager and Associate at (Trauth Buckle) and Leather Creations Product Design and Development but it's kind of all to (unintelligible) to a GNSO interest. The Free in University at Brussell. I think that's free University in (unintelligible). Let's see Joan, Poncelet, Robin approving, Monika. Okay everybody approving. I concur will approve (Adella Bodella). I know that she got twice actually. I guess that's a technical glitch at least appearing on my screen.

So we'll skip the second one, don't need to approve it twice. And there is (Melissa Richards) from Guyana, a member of several NGOs in Guyana. One of the interesting things I've found is that no one seems to be interested in issues that affects NGOs related to Internet, Internet governance or policymaking. Again this information seems to be cut short. Reference Renata again, no LinkedIn page but a Twitter handle though. Opinions, comments on (Alisa Richards), (Melissa). I don't know if that's a misspelling or not.

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes Robin, please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes. I remember meeting (Melissa) in Copenhagen. Also Renata introduced her to me at she came to one of the NCSG meetings so I approve.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Robin and Joan approving as well. Poncelet, Monika approved. Robin your hand is up. This is like an old hand? Okay. Anyway (Melissa Richards) approved. I concur with the list.

Then we have (Valik Minnakum) again probably a horrible pronunciation I trust you see what I mean. And a political science (unintelligible) and an

academic at the University of Papua in New Guinea. That's interesting coming from political science background passionate about government issues and to actively take part in (any) organization actually and so forth but not much in the way of reference, no LinkedIn page, no Web site no Twitter. Opinions, comments on...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: Well it looks like this person's email address is at a – at the University of Papua, New Guinea. So, you know, it looks like they're definitely affiliated with this university.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yet they list country as United States, might be interesting to ask the connection between them because I'd rather like to have a member from Papua New Guinea at least. I see Robin approving. Oh Maryam found a LinkedIn page. That's nice. Okay it looks good to me. It seems at least Robin, Monika Poncelet, okay everybody is approving that's good.

It might be worth asking her if she would like to prefer to listed as a Papua, New Guinea member but that's I guess we tried to presume she resides in the United States now so that's fine. So approved. Let's move on. (Sheila Ubatri) from India currently working on the in Indian Internet Governance Forum project as a consultant encourage and create awareness among Indian multistakeholder community in general (unintelligible) policy discussion. Again description has been cut short. See there is a LinkedIn page.

Research Associate at National Internet Exchange of India. Has a number of connections within ICANN people. anyway I see Robin is approving, (Sheila). Others? Oh that was quick everybody approving. And I agree so (Sheila) approved.

Next we have (Antonella Myapeti) from Argentina again individual user as an International Relations Specialist and a technology enthusiast. I'm interested in the area of social and political implications of the Internet and participating, regional, international Internet related events, reference again Renata. There is a LinkedIn page.

Opinions, comments? It looks like (Antonella) is getting approval from Joan, Poncelet, Robin. Monika was that expression of (unintelligible) approval for (Antonella) other earlier one. Okay everybody seems to be happy with (Antonella). I concur we approve her.

Next is (Patrick Escian), however that's pronounced from Nigeria. Individual description I'm of the opinion that the Third World country should be better empowered to facilitate and to advance Internet and make it a forum for the advancement of free speech. That (unintelligible) within NSCG approves but there's no reference, no LinkedIn page, no Web site. Comments, opinions? Anybody know this person or anything about him? Why do I get the feeling everybody has as bad voice as I do but I'm the only one speaking because you all keep on typing? Yes Poncelet there's indeed no Web site, no LinkedIn or anything.

Okay see Poncelet and Joan both saying that we should ask for more info. Any objections to that? Okay Robin agreeing. So I guess that's what we'll do, ask for more information. And Maryam please write to Mr. (Escian) in and ask for more information about references and information of his interest and its non-commercial nature.

Okay moving on at this time unless Monika wants to reject him outright. In principle we can do that but I presume not unless you say so. Next is (Freddie

Manulan) or (Manulin) however of where you pronounced it. From Indonesia references ccNSO without explaining more or what his relation to ccNSO is. Currently active in civil organizations, the condition and mission to assist the government in national development and as the community aspiration media and also in more the development international national (DN) as I presume.

But reference is (Carol Douglas), (El Sasar) (Abudwa Sutaba) an alumni ICANN fellows, has a LinkedIn page and his own domain to network system administration at (pegano) a domain Internet Indonesia. Really that ID does not seem to work. Well maybe it's just an email address because the domain exists and it's perfectly valid of course to maintain that. But Joan you want to speak please go.

Joan Kerr: I think he's okay because he is recommended by (Carol Douglas) and hopefully that's through recommendation. But (Carol Douglas) of course is quite active public comments. We can ask for more information if you feel more comfortable but I was going by the recommendation. So have - should we ask for more information?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay other opinions? So I see Poncelet wanting more information. It's actually interesting if his domain name is not used for HTTP at all. So it's not a Web site at all but the domain name exists. It has an imagery because it looks like it's an email only domain which would be an interesting thing to do. We don't - but it's perfectly valid of course so nothing wrong with that.

But still I see Poncelet and Joan requesting more information. Any other comments, views? Okay I guess that's what we'll do. So Maryam again request more information from (Freddie) about this any references and so forth if you got any of those, an explanation of what his noncommercial interest as usual.

Next (Claudia Lucchina) from the United States. You're an individual with its own domain name, Professor at Pariba State University in (unintelligible) in Brazil. I say research and work in issues connecting (unintelligible) and technology and in and visiting research area in Georgetown Washington DC. And again referencing Renata has LinkedIn page and his own Web site as well.

Comments? I see Robin approving (Claudia) and Joan likewise. And Joan and Monika how do you stand on (Claudia)? Let's see and Monika are you there? Have we lost Monika here at some point? Seem to be connecting but I'm not getting anything.

This is strange because see Monika seems to be online but get no response. Maybe there's some technical glitch or something. Okay let's move on and leave this pending until Monika comes back. Okay (unintelligible) response later so okay Monika. Okay Monika came back good.

So (Claudia Lucchina) approved. And that I concur with everybody else. He seems to be very academic and approved, sponsored by Renata again. Not as really been - and then we have someone we - I think we have heard about Matthew Shears referring Rafik Dammak. I see no LinkedIn page, no Web site. I wonder about why he doesn't list his new domain but nonetheless.

Yes okay I'll login well that - I'll have to report to Matthew that Robin wanted more info about him but I guess you are - even though it was just a joke. Okay so Robin, Poncelet, Joan approving. Monika are you approving Matthew? Okay I guess I find no excuse to disapprove him so Matthew approved after having stayed away from NCSG for almost a week.

And next is (Rachel Renaud) from Brazil, individual is a Professor in Brazil Digital Culture and Digital Rights, a Senior Researcher at Coding Rights and a (unintelligible) led NGO that works with digital rights and gender inclusion in Latin America. Editor of (unintelligible) and Vigilante, a newsletter. The coding rights I think is (Joanna Varonis) running again referenced by Renata Aquino, has LinkedIn page and two Web domains. Opinions on (Rachel)? Robin approving, Poncelet approving Joan approving, Monika approving. I concur we approve (Rachel Renaud).

So that was the list of individuals. Now for organizations I think we've immediately see a little improvement for this form we have and some of you see the navigation as a click view membership application before we get to the organizations link. So we might want a shortcut there but I trust you'll get to that organization's list. We have three organizations to go for applying.

First is Bedrock. I see that this is a bit strange that we have a - seem to have data missing in these - okay it's long and the short this review list is missing information that's opens when you click at the applicant. Have to work on this and that the country, so United States and the state admission can be found there when you click it open.

Incubating innovative innovations that facilitate the building of disaster resilient communities. We've appropriated innovations for various local problems in working with communities and organizations at grass roots level and with external communities like we (unintelligible) inside government, parties, universities and technology providers and create community-based and community org mechanisms for enhanced disaster response mitigation and preparedness. And those are in pilot for these mechanisms and where feasible replicate upscale and mainstream these for sustainable development for the coastal communities.

Then there is a Web site bedrock.ing. It looks okay. Comments, opinions on Bedrock? Maryam make a note that this is not a display of an organization application. It does not quite work the way it should be because the stated mission is not shown at all in the abbreviated list.

So you have to click it open and also you want to see representations you have to click on the Relationships tab to see the people that's representative. So this is one part probably need to work on this interface but you can find the information there. I need (George Leger Amina) so they actually have - they are offering a alternative representative at once and their director is listed as well so it looks good and formal in terms of the list.

And they are applying for NPOC which is also not (been made) obvious. You have to click at the Activities column to see that I think. So it seems that Joan, Monika, Robin at least have approved Bedrock. Poncelet just had comments for Bedrock I think it is yes. Correct me if I'm wrong but that it seems that everybody approved Bedrock. Okay Bedrock approved. I concur with everybody else on that account.

Second Maryam where did - okay that's - oh that's all we have, oh yes. You know, but yet I know Maryam is marking there stating the status immediately as we approve them so when they disappear from the list which is I guess as it should be.

Internet Development Initiative, IDI? (NDIN.net.) Opinions on that one?
Internet Development Initiative. Maybe in India I think. The stated mission objectives of the organization activities A, support growth concentration of the Internet. B, promote the development standards and service security and support to improve skills in service security? C, is (unintelligible) analyze of

threats in cyberspace recommendations for government and private sector public administrating increase the process and protection and advocacy for Internet users rights. E, support the development for of online media. F, initiatives or projects of information in communications technology such for needed technologies otherwise it's in promotion for implementation, G, initiate projects with government and private sector information technology and innovation.

H, support for print and online publications and I, organizing conferences (unintelligible) firms in ICT and cyber security.

And they are applying for both NCUC and NPOC I seen. And Robin is wondering how they are funded? Let me take a look at their Web site. They tell about themselves there. They claim to be a noncommercial entity. But I don't see details about anything about their funding.

This is not a formally a government entity if they came to be a noncommercial entity but we could ask about their funding. Let's see where - can't see any details there or that (voice). This is in Georgia so it may not be all that trivial to determine. I have an understanding which may be incorrect that at least some cases in Georgia their government's relations with the noncommercial organization is somewhat difficult sometimes so it - or let's say complicated so perhaps asking for details is the right thing to do. Any other opinions? It's an IDE.

Joan Kerr: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: This is Joan.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Yes not just ask for where did they get their funds but also how they use it because sometimes we can get funds from organizations and we they can that's - but how do they use those funds to benefit the community?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. On the website you can see there a list of projects which gives some kind of idea, but certainly more details about the - where they get their money and how they use it would be useful. So we'll ask for more details, especially we need to know their funding source. Maryam, did you get the idea what to ask? If not, you can I guess check - work that question with Joan. Okay, you got it. Good.

Let's look at the last one, which is (Lakota Light). It's in the United States. Their stated mission is a little bit unusual. It says that (Joseph Kenneth Winski) is a highly regarded and experienced business of finance management executive for over 30 years. During the course of his career, (Kenneth Winski) has provided moral leadership and expertise is business and finance organizations in both the private and public sectors.

Most recently (Kenneth Winski) created (Lakota Light) to reflect his vision of supporting the cultural traditional of the Lakota Sioux and assisting their mental, physical and spiritual development while developing relationships that encourage self-sufficiency and shelter, food, and clothing. Do we have something with an e-mail address? Which one? Under ID, let me check.

Yes there is. I can find it, Maryam, so maybe you're not looking right. Net relationships, official representatives (unintelligible) emeritus and everything.

Okay. So you found it. Now back to (Lakota Light). What do you think of (Lakota Light)?

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Robin, please go ahead.

Robin Gross: This is Robin, yes. It doesn't look like the website's working. It looks like it's just sort of a GoDaddy parked page, so I'm wondering what's their website because it doesn't look like it's this one that they put in the application.

Tapani Tarvainen: That's a good point. I guess in the past we have pretty much routinely rejected organizations with a broken website as a rule but this under construction thing I guess we could ask them to fix that and come back to us, or if it's a temporary glitch or whatever. But an organization should have a functional website.

Okay Maryam and Monika, I note that this is the last one so let's move (Lakota Light) pending. Maryam, send them an e-mail noting that we won't approve them until their website is working, okay? So with that, we're done with the membership applications.

Moving down the agenda, may I suggest we change the order of the last two items because the last one is a simple yes/no, in fact that should not take a long one in the case. So (unintelligible) discussion is unlikely to result in an actual decision at this point. Any objections to that? Okay so I see everybody agreed to keep (unintelligible) from the list so we consider that done.

Okay let's take a look at the member approval removal procedures. Robin, you want to explain it, I guess? Does everybody have that Google Docs link? Just in case, here you go.

Robin Gross: Okay. So first let me apologize that that is not completely done but it more (unintelligible) the meat of it is there, except I want to build out the appeals part a little bit more and it needs some formatting, some noting and numbering and all that stuff to - for the formatting to make sense. But I think other than that, the heart of it, the meat of it is here and so rather than go through all of it, because it's quite a few, you know, five pages of so of pretty dense text, I just wanted to draw people's attention to a couple of key issues that I think we need to think about and maybe come to some kind of decision at some point on.

And one is something that Tapani's already flagged over in section - the process for review of eligibility and then we're talking about making a decision for terminating membership. And the issue is do we want to change that threshold such that, you know, the way our charter currently exists by default, our decisions should be unanimous with nobody dissenting in order for a decision to be taken.

However, the charter does allow us the leeway, should we all decide, to adjust that threshold for certain issues. And so really the question here is is this one of those issues that we want to consider adjusting that threshold or do we want to keep a - do we want to keep it unanimous? And what I typed in there was 80% just - really just as a placeholder because I want folks to think about, you know, because this is kind of a big deal where we really would be changing what is current default on a specific issue. And there may be reasons to do it.

It might, you know, it might be necessary in order to actually make progress. If you've always got, you know, one person who could veto any decision, then it's really hard to move forward sometimes in some circumstances, but on the other hand, on an issue like membership removal, maybe it's appropriate to have a 100% threshold. So, you know, I could see on both of sides of that issue and I thought that was something we might want to discuss. So let me just see if anybody has any comments or thoughts on that issue.

It looks like Poncelet says majority consensus and Tapani's asking if - for clarification if that would be majority, which is would be, I don't know, what, 51%, or some kind of roughly defined consensus. Oh, Ponce, please go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: Thank you, Robin. Poncelet speaking for the record. I think, Robin, based on what you just said, I think if we have a majority consensus on something like two-thirds, 66% or if we want it to be very close to 100, 80% I said earlier I said that would be better, because what might happen is that you just have someone if you are looking for a minimum 100% consensus, someone can just veto it, you know? So we don't want it to think we're intentional whereby things would be stalled in the process. It currently has a (unintelligible) majority consensus. So I would suggest it be two-thirds, which is 66% or 80%. That's what I just wanted to suggest. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thanks. Yes that makes a lot of sense. Joan's got her hand up. Please.

Joan Kerr: Thanks, Robin. My sense is that is the vote would be the last step, so there would have been - the member would have been advised on the procedure ahead of time to respond. So I think 80% is way too high because at that point this other step would have been - it's in combination, right? So I think, you know, 60% at least and 80% I think, but 60% was sort of my gauge because

it's more than 51% but less than 80 and it's in combination with the other steps as well. So I just wanted to say that. I thought 80 was too high.

Tapani Tarvainen: In that case, Joan, I'll have to comment. Sixty percent means that neither constituency alone can prevent in expelling a member. Are you sure that's what you want? Sixty percent means six members, so that could be theoretically that one constituency alone could purge the other one without be able...

Joan Kerr: Oh I see, okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: So that's why I think 80% makes more sense if we want such a limit.

Joan Kerr: Ah, okay. So then it involves everyone. Oh, I got - okay I see, sorry. Yes I agree then in that point so that it is fair to the person that's being removed. Okay. I agree with the 80% then.

Tapani Tarvainen: Although I still say that it's not obvious why we need to deviate from the full consensus in this case. I try to think of reasons for doing so. Of course the general point Robin made is very good that full consensus requirements makes things difficult but that's intentionally in our charter to begin with, so why would this be an exception.

I can think of the argument that for the very same reason that we need to have full consensus approving members on there make it easier to remove them but the requirement of having - approving or keeping a member should be a high threshold. So in that case, I kind of understand the notion that we should have a lower threshold for expelling someone, even though I don't really see the need. I can't easily see a situation where it would matter. As I said, if we give it an 80% that means that one dissenter won't block it but - and if we go to

60% then we are placed in a situation where one constituency can be overridden. So I don't see this as a significant issue but I'm happy with 80% or full consensus.

I note though that this procedure is something that we need to get approval from the full membership later on. It's not - we can't decide by ourselves. It explicitly says so in our charter.

Robin Gross: Yes, Tapani, that's actually something else that I wanted to talk a little bit about is sort of like the process for this moving forward. So let's say that this committee gets a document that we're comfortable with in the next, you know, two weeks or something, then presumably we would say, okay, we got something, we're going to put it out the membership for - to get some feedback on and, I don't know.

I mean the charter says we need to put it out for approval but it's also pretty, you know, it leaves us a lot of flexibility with respect to what does that actually mean. So I'd be curious to see if anyone had any thoughts about how we should do this in terms of that approval process. I'd prefer not to, you know, spend too much - too many more cycles on it, you know, lots of iterations but we do have some flexibility to design that approval process in a way that I think will make sense for us.

I don't know, I would say let's try to get something that we are comfortable with finished in the next week or two and then we'll put it out for the list and then say, okay, unless we get significant objections to this, this is what we're going to do, sort of a speak-now-or-forever-hold-your peace and then, you know, leave it up to people to comment if they have comments or not if they don't. I don't know, that's just my suggestion but it's, you know, we can design this I think with a lot of flexibility.

Tapani Tarvainen: The answer will be subject to membership approval. It does not require that we should have a formal vote or anything, we can do it simply by, well, the way you suggest or some other process. Poncelet, do you want to speak?

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes. Poncelet speaking for the record. I just want to say please don't worry, Robin. I said if we (unintelligible) as soon as possible on this document in taking it out the membership, which it does create more (unintelligible) something and whereby people can just simply agree or they don't agree and the majority consensus and the document's approved. Because if they're willing to wait for various comments to come in from the membership, it's going to drag, as we know, sometimes (unintelligible) within the NCSG.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Poncelet. I have a feeling that the membership may have some ideas that they will not like some details on this and want to suggest changes, but definitely let's get this to a form that looks get enough for us, then throw it out to the membership for all types of comment. And I think we may have to get one - at least one round after that general discussion and then get approval for membership.

I think the process will be enough that we simply get to the point that - where if nobody expresses explicit disapproval on the discuss list, or at least not too many, maybe we'll see the threshold on a number of people, and if too many object and we can't change it to such a form that there are no more significant objections from too many people then we'll have to put it for a vote. But I don't think that will be necessary. But I think we will need to have a discussion on the list and I rather expect that we will have to make some changes on the details we have missed or something.

But it does look reasonably good to me at this point. So maybe we could simply now send a link to the NCSG discuss and ask people to comment and say that please come up with whatever you think complain - comment about anything and then see what happens from that. Yes, Robin, ratifying it would be welcome, although having it as a - actually, yes, it would be nice to have something we can post to the list as such for the record but still leave it in the Google Docs for editing.

There were a few open issues there I wanted to comment on. You are referring to including any alternate members in a couple of places. Robin, would you explain what you mean by that, because our charter does not speak of any alternate members.

Robin Gross: Right, right. What that refers to is earlier in the document it says that if one of the members of the executive committee is going to be one of the requesters of a review process, then they would recuse themselves from that decision and their - the constituency that they represent would appoint an alternate for that decision.

So that was, you know, you're right, it's not something that's in our charter but it's something that is being proposed here that - such that, you know, we wouldn't have a constituency that didn't have their representative on the - or both representatives, it doesn't have two representatives on the decision making because one had to recuse themselves, for example. So we get to - the constituency can appoint an alternate for that decision. So that was the proposal but, yes, it's not a specific thing in our charter. It would just be an alternate for this decision. I hope that makes sense and I didn't just confuse things more.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I can see that it's not - that's not exactly well - okay that would need clarification here in the text. It may be replaced by an alternate represent. That means that we'd ask the constituency ExComs to appoint alternates to their...hm. Also when you say that members who are signatories on the request for review shall recuse themselves, I'm not quite sure if that is necessary.

I want to - I'd like to have opinions if we want to remove someone then EC members can take initiative on that but that means then they'll have to recuse themselves and it results in this kind of extraordinary arrangement so that we pursue alternates, which are not provided for in our charter. It's a bit complicated thing. Anybody else have opinions on this? Is this a good way of doing it in the first place or - and if so, how should we phrase it here to make it clearer that it actually works? So that's something we - I suspect will be picked up by some other people who are more into process elements of our membership.

One thing we might also do is that - and when we - that we ask for if it's decided that it's not controversial than it (unintelligible) - sorry, my voice is failing. But some way or - one way or another we'll have to get more people in the membership involved in this. So we could use this as is and this is the first (unintelligible) proposal, making it clear that we want comments and we expect to be rewording this and send it out without much further ado. Just splitting it amongst ourselves may take longer and we'll have to put it out to the membership at large anyway. Or should we take, say, two weeks with each other or until our next meeting to see if we need to do...?

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, Joan?

Robin Gross: Yes, sorry this is Robin. Yes I'm just - I'm not - I feel like it's not quite ready for putting it out yet. I worry that in its current form it's going to maybe just cause a little bit more confusion. If you give me another week or two just to, you know, dot all the I's and cross all the t's and I think it will be better in the long run. I just worry that putting it out quite like this is, you know, is just going to cause people to be confused because it's just not quite typed the way I want it to be before it goes out to people.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan, your hand is up.

Joan Kerr: Yes this is Joan. I agree. Well, Robin, I agree with Robin that just a bit of tidying up. Right now it seems uncomfortable to say anything because I think that it - I'm not sure about the decision-making and I think that if we send it out after Robin cleans it up a little bit and has (unintelligible) draft document, it might help us more. So I just want to put that out there. And maybe just reading it, I read it this week a few times. Of course I was busy and I was tired but I agree, we should tidy it up a little bit and then maybe we read it again in a week or so and send it out to the membership, I'd probably feel more comfortable.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. It seems we agree it's not quite ready for publication yet. But let's make a timeline so that we will - Robin said two weeks to tidy it up. Then we'll look it up and send it. Still we have - I said we have to discuss that on that list or if, failing that, then next meeting, say, in one month we might have to agree on that by the way too so we could then put it out. If we set it too long, if we delay it until our next meeting.

Robin Gross: Yes let's try not to delay it to our next meeting but let's try to do the work on the list, and then whatever doesn't get done on the list, you know, if we have

to we can do it at our next meeting. But, you know, this has been our queue for long, let's - I've been, you know, working on it. I'm prepared to finish this up here in the next two weeks and so let's get it out.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So we'll give you two weeks to have it in the way that you feel is pretty enough when we discuss it on the list and decide when - if we're all happy with it and then send it out but give our next meeting as the final deadline. If we can't agree on the list, then we'll finish it there to the point we can send it out. Is that okay? If you get that we're unhappy on the list, fine, if not (unintelligible).

With that - while we're at it, the next meeting I was thinking of May 5 tentatively. If everybody's happy with that, we could all agree on that at this point, by the way. It's four weeks from now. Is this time okay for us all, everybody then? This is just about one of the very few hours in their day that is not between midnight and 6 am for everybody, although I guess it's already past midnight for Monika now. I'm waiting to hear Monika agree, because this is a bad time for her.

Okay we'll wait awhile to confirm with tentatively estimating May 5. And for this process we agree that Robin will tidy it up and put it on the list. When she thinks it ready we'll discuss it on the list. And if we agree it's good enough then we'll send it out and if we don't, we'll talk about in our next meeting and send it out for the general public, okay?

And that's it on the agenda tonight. Any other business anybody wants to bring up? Okay one thing I noted here is if you have comments that occur to you about this (CDCRM) form that we haven't noticed, please send me an e-mail or Joan is also on the team and we'll be working on that, try to make it

easier to do. Okay. Well then thank you everybody. Good day, good night,
whatever, whenever you happen to be.

Man: Okay. Good day. Bye, all.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone for attending the call. (Joni), you may stop the
recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you very much for your time today.
Goodbye.

END